

JPRS 74000

13 August 1979

East Europe Report

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1707

Extracts from Enver Hoxha's 'Reflections on China'

Part II

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available from Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		1. REPORT NO. JPRS 74000	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.																		
4. Title and Subtitle EAST EUROPE REPORT: POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL, AND MILITARY AFFAIRS, No. 1707			5. Report Date 13 August 1979																			
7. Author(s)			8. Performing Organization Rep. No.																			
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.																			
			11. Contract(C) or Grant(G) No. (C) (G)																			
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address As above			13. Type of Report & Period Covered																			
			14.																			
15. Supplementary Notes Extracts from Enver Hoxha's 'Reflections on China' Part II																						
16. Abstract (Limit: 200 words) This serial report contains information on official party and government pronouncements and writings on significant domestic political developments; information on general sociological problems and developments in such areas as demography, manpower, public health and welfare, education, and mass organizations; and articles on military and civil defense, organization, theory, budgets, and hardware.																						
17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors <table border="0"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> International Affairs</td> <td>Propaganda</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Albania</td> <td>Political Science</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Bulgaria</td> <td>Sociology</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Czechoslovakia</td> <td>Military Organizations</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> German Democratic Republic</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Hungary</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Poland</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Romania</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Yugoslavia</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>					<input type="checkbox"/> International Affairs	Propaganda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Albania	Political Science	<input type="checkbox"/> Bulgaria	Sociology	<input type="checkbox"/> Czechoslovakia	Military Organizations	<input type="checkbox"/> German Democratic Republic		<input type="checkbox"/> Hungary		<input type="checkbox"/> Poland		<input type="checkbox"/> Romania		<input type="checkbox"/> Yugoslavia	
<input type="checkbox"/> International Affairs	Propaganda																					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Albania	Political Science																					
<input type="checkbox"/> Bulgaria	Sociology																					
<input type="checkbox"/> Czechoslovakia	Military Organizations																					
<input type="checkbox"/> German Democratic Republic																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Hungary																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Poland																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Romania																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Yugoslavia																						
b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms																						
c. COSATI Field/Group 5D, 5K, 15																						
18. Availability Statement Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22161			19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 91																		
			20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price																		

13 August 1979

EAST EUROPE REPORT
POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1707

EXTRACTS FROM ENVER HOXHA'S 'REFLECTIONS ON CHINA'

Part II

Tirana ATA in English 0900 GMT 11-26 Jul 79 AU

[Series of extracts from the first volume of book "Reflections on China," by Enver Hoxha, AWP Central Committee First Secretary; Part I of series has been published in JPRS 73890, 24 Jul 79, No 1701 of this series]

[11 Jul 79]

[Text] Tirana, July 11 (ATA)--The pages of the first volume "Reflections on China" drawn from the political diary of Comrade Enver Hoxha contain also many notes which expose the nation-chauvinist positions of the Chinese revisionists, their anti-Marxist foreign policy.

Their anti-Marxist and chauvinist policy is obvious in many directions. It is also manifested in the territorial claims of the Chinese leadership towards the other countries, in its rapprochement with American imperialism, with various revisionist countries, with the reactionary regimes and forces, etc.

In the note of Friday August 21, 1964 and of Saturday, August 22, 1964, Comrade Enver Hoxha brings many facts and exposes the national-chauvinist positions of the Chinese as well as their territorial claims.

In the note of Wednesday, November 18, 1964, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes about the rash idea expressed by Chou En-lai setting up of another United Nations organisation. The note appears under the title:

Zhou Enlai's Idea of Setting Up Another UNO Will Not Succeed

Now, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, on the occasion of the visit to Beijing of Subandrio, the foreign minister of Indonesia, Zhou Enlai delivered a speech in which, amongst other things, he said, "Another United Nations organization in opposition to the former one can be created" and appealed for its creation. This is the idea which Zhou Enlai launched while speaking about "the re-organization of the UNO," etc.

If we take this idea of the Chinese comrades from the propaganda angle, simply as pressure aimed at the Americans, to intimidate them, this has its effect. But if we take it from the other angle, that this idea has not been launched only for the aims mentioned above, but in order to work in the direction of setting up this international organization, this is a rash, immature, ill-considered idea, and difficult to achieve. The creation of such an organization, or the idea of creating it, is very hazardous, and could damage the prestige of China's foreign policy. This idea, or this decision, has not been carefully weighed by the Chinese comrades, and has been taken under the impulse of existing circumstances.

The establishment of a new organization of the United Nations, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, is a titanic undertaking which, in my opinion, the Chinese comrades have not thought about deeply. They do not see that "their democratic friends" are raising all sorts of obstacles to the holding of a meeting of a political character, such as that of Asian and African countries, which is to be held in Algiers, are postponing it once, postponing it for a second time, because they have many contradictory interests, because they have links and interests with the Americans, the Soviets, the Titoites, with the devil and his son. Hence, to launch the idea of setting up a new international organization of states at the present time, in these conditions, not only is absurd, but also makes it hard to wage the struggle properly within this existing organization to get rid of the American and revisionist influence. The idea of setting up a new organization, continues Comrade Enver Hoxha, should not have been launched so rashly by Zhou Enlai. The Chinese comrades have neither informed us, nor consulted us on this question. We consider this a grave failure and error on their part. On the one hand, in the United Nations we raise the question of the expulsion of Chiang Kai-shek and the admission of People's China, and on the other hand, China seeks to create a new international organization. This is not a serious stand either towards us, or towards the other states friendly to China, which are fighting for it to take its proper place.

Hence, I think, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha, China's idea will not have any success in this situation and may do us harm.

In the note of Tuesday, February 2, 1965, Comrade Enver Hoxha criticises the Chinese policy of isolating in itself. The note is entitled:

A Rigid Policy of Isolation of the Chinese Government

It seems to me that the policy of the Chinese Government, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes, does not show the necessary dynamism and breadth of view, which the moments, the circumstances, and China's potential and importance in the international arena require. It appears sluggish, somewhat hesitant, isolated and limited to certain given fields and specific problems. This policy lacks that initiative and regionalization which a great socialist power should have in the development of world events. Most of the time events burst upon it and it is unable to foresee or avoid them, to act in

advance, to change, or halt their course of development, when these events are to the detriment of socialism and world peace. We cannot say that the Chinese policy does not react, **does not** take a stand, does not influence events, or the development and solution of them, but this policy acts with delay, not to the extent it should and when it should. I think that the Chinese underestimate, disdain and have neglected the struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism within Europe. This is because of various passing circumstances, which imperialism and modern revisionism have created and are still creating, to the detriment of socialism, which have grave consequences for the other continents where the revolution is seething, where the peoples are fighting, where the intrigues are major ones, and the situations unstable.

I am still of the opinion that the Chinese comrades see the struggle within Europe and the United States of America as remote.

The imperialists of every description and the modern revisionists are always in feverish activity everywhere, in all corners of the world. Up to a point, the Chinese are sitting as onlookers, while the enemies form and dissolve alliances, hatch up plots, attack, kill, arm, disarm, provide "credits" on heavy conditions, exert blackmail by suspending credits, replace one another in the "pasture," etc., etc.

And when the Chinese take some initiative, like that of "forming another UNO," they do this without considering deeply what it will lead to, and what results it will have.

I think they do not study all the circumstances thoroughly, are not fully in favour of examining events on a world scale, their view remains within narrow bounds, they hesitate to act correctly, firmly and at the right time, when the situations present themselves, or when these situations should be created. Speaking about China's policy towards the Asian countries, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

It seems to me that it is valuable not merely to go and make an official visit to those countries, or to provide some credit for them, but that it is also important to bring about the development of all forms of friendly relations, cultural, artistic manifestations, etc. with these states. I have the impression that not only are the Chinese comrades hesitating in this direction, but that they are not taking a proper view of the development, culture, and good, positive experience of others. I do not want to say that they are not concerning themselves about this, but they have shut themselves rather tightly within the framework of their own culture, and do not want anything good from the life, customs and positive experience of others in this field to penetrate into China. This narrow view in the national framework could lead the Chinese comrades into ways which are not good, and to a sectarianism or harmful isolation, a state of complete autarky. We see this not only in certain political stands of the Chinese comrades in the international arena, but also in some incorrect ideas of theirs in connection with world culture, including the repertoire of our songs, which have a sound people's character.

These views also lead the Chinese comrades into underestimation of the activities of the capitalists, into inadequate appreciation of events, and failure to maintain the necessary stands at the proper time. This can lead and has led the Chinese comrades to the position that they compare world events with the events of their war against Chiang Kai-shek, and from this comparison they draw the conclusions on how they should act and define their tasks. In other words, their internal experience is everything, and they see the events in the world in this light. I find such a thing neither complete nor correct.

The internal experience one has lived through is a great treasure-store, but the experience of revolutions in the world, of victories and defeats of others is also a colossal thing which should be known and used. For Marxists, world experience is a broad field where they must carefully seek out the good things and learn from the bad things in order to avoid them. It is the custom of the Chinese comrades to tell others that they learn and profit from them, but I believe that, in fact, they do not value the experience and culture of others as much as they say.

The Chinese comrades speak against great-state nationalist views, but it seems to me that if the above mentioned questions are not seen correctly in all their development, then such ideas as "mine is better than the others'" can open the way to mistakes of great-state chauvinism.

Comrade Enver Hoxha thoroughly analyses and exposes the foreign policy of China as a policy of self-isolation. The note of Friday, July 14, 1967, appears under the title:

The Foreign Policy of China--A Policy of Self-Isolation

Since the beginning of the cultural revolution, if not earlier, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, the Chinese comrades have been developing an ill-defined foreign policy, or to put it better, their foreign policy leans mostly towards self-isolation. This is not an active and mobile policy. They are shutting themselves away, and with this stand they give the impression that they are infatuated with this policy. In fact, we may say regretfully that their policy is not making itself felt in the way it should and as much as it should, in the international arena. It is not a policy which, based on a correct political line, on the aims and the resolute struggle against American imperialism and Soviet revisionism, follows up and exploits the contradictions in the international arena, works out correct tactics of struggle and aid, according to the changing circumstances, the time and countries.

Their general tactic is: "Struggle with all, hostility with all." Such a tactic is extremely sectarian and leads only to the course, "either with me or against me," "if you do not think and act as I say or as I act, then you are against me."

If we observe the official state policy of the Chinese comrades, continues Comrade Enver Hoxha further on, we shall see that it is not at all balanced, can say that it is non-existent, or when it is expressed, it is wrong.

It seems that in the countries where there are Chinese political and economic emigrants, the Chinese comrades have openly set them in motion in defence of China, propagating that they should act in violent ways with the authorities of the countries in which they are living. This propaganda is not wise. The authorities of different countries retaliate against the Chinese emigrants for their acts of violence, and this is natural, because the bourgeois and capitalist leaders cannot be tolerant in this direction.

On the other hand, the relations of China with nearly all the capitalist states have been built upon violence and the violation of all diplomatic norms. There is no foreign capitalist embassy in Beijing which has not been surrounded and attacked by the "Red Guards." What is happening in Beijing is precisely what occurred in Jakarta when the Indonesian fascists attacked the Chinese Embassy. With these and many other gestures in its relations with other countries of the world, China is creating great rigidity, making it impossible to act either in politics and propaganda, or in reciprocal commercial relations.

The lack of control and the unclarity in the political and cultural slogans, and even worse, when these are distorted and manipulated by the capitalist and revisionist propaganda, isolate China and create a certain coolness among the peoples of the world, because this self-isolation, brought about with such astounding carelessness, does not allow China to display its successes in all fields in the world arena. The Chinese exhibitions have disappeared, they have been replaced with the little red book of Mao's quotations, with a few magazines which are printed in Beijing and distributed abroad by passing from hand to hand.

Capitalism and revisionism are bemusing peoples' brains with unrestrained propaganda against China. Apparently the Chinese comrades think, in contrast to what they say, that the "ivory tower" is best. It seems they think that the capitalists and the revisionists are greatly put out when China is not present in the international arena. This judgment is wrong. Because to avoid the presence of China is precisely what the enemies want so they can act freely.

Chinese diplomacy, underlines Comrade Enver Hoxha, is inactive, not only in relations with the capitalist countries but also with the liberated countries of Africa and Asia. The bourgeois leaders of these countries are benefiting from the passivity of the Chinese diplomacy. They simply take some aid from China (when it provides it), but apart from this, nothing else is heard. And this sluggishness is because of the unwise policy of China.

For Chen Yi [name as received] it was a great success that "the authorities of the Republic of Mali allowed the distribution of some books with the

quotations of Mao." This is lamentable. The bourgeoisie in France is printing these quotations itself and selling them freely on the market. As everyone knows, the French bourgeoisie has tight control over the authorities of Mali, who know very well how to keep China far away from their people.

This whole mistake lies in the fact that, although they say that their links with the peoples must be strengthened, they have not found the way to achieve this aim. These links cannot be achieved in subversive ways and without finding the splits between the capitalist leaders of these countries themselves. These splits must be exploited.

The Chinese comrades have great faith in spontaneity. They take their time and say: "There is time, seeing our example, the peoples will follow us." They are wrong when they think that their example is all that is needed for the victory of the peoples, especially when this example is not very clear.

The communist comrades throughout the world are not finding the necessary aid in the Chinese policy and diplomacy. Let us take the Arab-Israeli conflict. What is China doing in the diplomatic field in these delicate moments? Nothing organized.

China, a great socialist country, cannot be permitted to pursue such a policy without perspective, full of apathy, and extremely sectarian. Comrade Enver Hoxha underlines further on. It is the duty of China to play a main and decisive role in the international arena, where resolute stands against the enemies must be maintained, while taking advantage of their contradictions, which must be worked on to make them deeper, because they assist our struggle.

China speaks about strategy and tactics, but we do not see any tactic in the Chinese diplomacy. It is conducting an opportunist policy with the local bourgeoisie (the principles of the 8th Congress of the Communist Party of China about coexistence with the national bourgeoisie remain in force, the local capitalists still receive rent from their factories which have been nationalized), other organized parties are permitted in the front there, at a time when the communist party is in confusion and disarray.

The Chinese diplomacy Has Fallen Asleep

Is the title of another note of Monday, July 24, 1967, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: This is the most favourable moment ever for action on a broad scale in the Arab countries on the part of China, or another such moment will not occur for a long time to come. It seems to me that the Chinese diplomacy has fallen into a deep sleep and is dreaming unrealizable dreams,

Following the Israeli attack of June, the Arab countries and their leaders now find themselves in a difficult situation.

The Soviet revisionists are maneuvering undisturbed in the Arab countries. The American imperialists, too, are going about their own work, and so are those other powers which have predatory interests in these countries. What is China doing? China is carrying out the cultural revolution.

However, if you are going to the Arab countries to make propaganda about the cultural revolution, to exalt the cult of Mao and to do the groundwork to sell his photographs and the red book of quotations there, when the ground is slipping from under the Arabs' feet, you had better stay where you are, because you'll make matters worse.

[12 Jul 79]

[Text] Tirana, July 12 (ATA)--In the note of Saturday, July 29, 1967, Comrade Enver Hoxha condemns the tactics of silence of the Chinese leadership about the international problems. The note is entitled:

China and International Events

China, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, has shut itself away. Even its closest friends, as we are, are not hearing anything of what is going on within China, how things are going there, how the cultural revolution is developing, are they seizing power and consolidating it, are they proceeding with the organization of the party, or not? How is the economy developing? Or what about the agriculture? Nothing, absolutely nothing is being let out.

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha continues:

China has completely relinquished involvement in external affairs. It is not involved at all in international problems, its voice is not heard on any question, because it has chosen the road of silence. Is this a Marxist-Leninist stand? No. Can this be excused by saying, "We are occupied with the cultural revolution?" No. Can they say, "We have neither the cadres, nor the technical and financial possibilities to do this?" No not by any means.

There is no real excuse for this major mistake being made by the Chinese comrades who are using the tactic of silence and an alleged disdain of international problems. This stand is condemnable, unacceptable, and non-Marxist. Objectively, this stand assists imperialism and modern revisionism. In fact, it is a quelling of the political struggle, quelling of the stern polemic, quelling of the exposure of the fiendish deeds of the enemies of the peoples and communism. And the enemies like it if you don't speak, if you don't criticize, if you don't disturb the waters, if you don't ruin their plans, and leave them free to work in peace. No, this is not right.

It greatly pleases the Chinese if you follow them, but follow them in what? In their silence? Should we fold our arms and wait open-mouthed till it pleases the Chinese to engage in international problems? Those who think and act in this way are fools and not Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries.

Perhaps the Chinese, with their "strategic eye," continues Comrade Enver Hoxha, are seeking to remove the danger of a third world war from Asia to Europe, to remove the threat from their borders, and through their silence "to allow" the contradictions to develop in Europe. However such a thing must not be pursued passively. It is in our interest to destroy modern revisionism, first of all in the Soviet Union, to destroy the Soviet-American alliance, and to destroy American imperialism.

But the struggle against them must be waged on a world scale, must be very active, and not passive, left to spontaneity. We must demand the contradictions between the capitalists and revisionists, but the Chinese tactic of silence is not correct. Here there is something big which is not in order. Seen from the Marxist-Leninist angle, it turns out that China has toned down the strong, principled, basic struggle against the Soviet revisionists, while against the others it is not saying a word.

Can this whole situation be ignored under the pretext that they are occupied with the cultural revolution? Can this whole situation be explained by saying, "We have no reliable people?" It is hard to accept such a thing. The cultural revolution might go on for years, but will it continue like this, with this lack of interest in the major world problems?

We base these assessments on the facts which we have. Time will clear things up for us.

The Voice of China Is Not Being Heard in the International Arena

In the title of another note of Wednesday, March 20, 1968. Comrade Enver Hoxha writes among others:

From what we can see, in the international political arena the voice of China is almost, if not completely, paralysed.

No pretext is valid to cover up this absence which is very much felt. It will be even worse if the problems of international policy are underrated and arrogantly disdained while justifying this stand from the standpoint: even if I do not intervene, even if I do not have my say, the world needs me. Even if I do not speak and act, the world is afraid of me, nothing can be done without me.

In practice, the voice of China is not being heard, thus it is not acting wisely.

China is saying nothing, either because it has no head, no time, or does not deign to. This situation cannot be accepted and must be changed as quickly as possible.

But to whom can we express these opinions, with whom should we discuss them? For nearly a year they have not had an ambassador even here in our country. Can this lack of ambassador here be covered by the excuse, "We haven't a good man?" Or is it because of their silent dissatisfaction that we are not following their mistaken tactic of silence, and not shouting hosannas to Mao? No, we do not accept such things. This stagnation of the Chinese policy in the world arena is very dangerous for the struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism.

In the note of Thursday April 25, 1968, Comrade Enver Hoxha dwells on the tactics of silence pursued by the Chinese leaders about the international events. The note is entitled:

The Chinese Comrades Continue To Shut Themselves Up in Their Own Shell

Under the cloak of the cultural revolution the Chinese, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, have shut themselves up completely in their own shell. They want to give this revolution the look of a "world revolution," but in practice they are doing nothing to ensure that it can at least be given the name of a "world" revolution. They are simply publishing the quotations of Mao in millions of copies and in many languages, making millions and billions of Mao badges and spreading slogans in praise of him. Nothing else, absolutely nothing else.

All the contacts of China with the external world have been completely frozen, if not broken off altogether. All the Chinese ambassadors have been withdrawn from the countries where they were serving. Neither papers, nor XINHUA, nor Radio Beijing deal with any international problem.

In the note of Tuesday, October 15, 1968, Comrade Enver Hoxha points out:

In the strategy of China, the Soviet revisionists are considered the main and most powerful enemies, the enemies which have the greatest possibility to attack it and damage it most. China also considers the Americans savage it most. China also considers the Americans savage enemies, but with fewer possibilities than the Soviets to attack and damage it. This is because the Soviets have land borders with China, while the Americans, in the main, must land from the sea.

However, it must not be forgotten that the United States of America becomes very dangerous if it manages to use militarist Japan as its bayonet, and the other countries of that region, from Indonesia to Australia, etc., as bases, and the peoples there as cannon fodder.

On the other hand, the Soviet revisionists have a number of very real points if they attack China. Not only must they prepare for a protracted war in Asia, but first of all, public opinion must be prepared for such a war, and this is not so easy.

The other weakness of the Soviet revisionists is Europe. Before they enter into war with China they must secure their flanks.

In his note Comrade Enver Hoxha underlines that the Soviet Union is not the stronger, but the weaker of the two imperialist powers, with a very long border to defend, with very wavering allies and with an imperialist partner, the United States of America, which aims to seize power and world domination from it.

The Chinese Are Silent About the Events in Czechoslovakia and Europe

The note of Tuesday, April 29, 1969, says that there is not even a peep out of the Chinese comrades about what is occurring in Czechoslovakia, Poland and Europe. In the newspapers and what they say on their radio, continues Comrade Enver Hoxha, they are not giving the slightest indication of what we are writing and saying against the revisionists. Astounding.

We are informed from Prague that the strict surveillance by the Czechoslovaks around the Chinese Embassy has been lifted, those who enter the Chinese Embassy are not controlled, the Chinese only listen to what they say and that is all. Astonishing.

The employees of the Chinese Embassy have told our comrades: Our stand towards the Czechs depends on their stand toward the Soviets, that is to say, even if the Czechs of Dubcek are fascists, they need only be anti-Soviet, and "they are fine." Astounding.

The Chinese tactics are that, until the "opportune moment," "until the situation is clarified," they are saying nothing. Or they are proceeding from the wrong principle: "Provided they are anti-Soviet, even if they serve the counterrevolution, this does not affect us much, because they are in Europe," and the fact is that the Chinese policy is not concerned at all about Europe. Astounding.

The Foreign Policy of the P. R. of China Is Chaotic

In continuation of his notes about the foreign policy of the P. R. of China, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes in the note dated: Durrës, Tuesday, July 27, 1971:

The whole foreign policy of the People's Republic of China is undefined, chaotic, a vacillating pragmatic policy. Sometimes isolated and wrong, sometimes open, as it is now, but still wrong. Zhou Enlai, with his right opportunist views, makes the foreign policy of China. He consults no one decides himself, sometimes getting general approval in principle from Mao.

For China, Europe is no longer of any value in the revolution. The mighty strikes and demonstrations of the European working class are of no value in Zhou's eyes. For him only a few demonstrations in Washington are of value. Likewise, the Marxist-Leninist parties, which have been created, are worthless to Zhou.

Zhou Enlai says a number of absurd things in the information which he gives us on Nixon's visit to China. He pretends that France, too, permits the entry of Britain into the European Common Market in order to strengthen the anti-American position of these countries. To think in this way means you understand nothing about politics. Pompidou is not De Gaulle. For the French bourgeoisie, its traditional allies have been and still are the Anglo-Saxon countries: the United States of America and Britain. Germany has been the traditional enemy of France and likewise of Britain. In any situation, Britain will seek support from the United States of America, notwithstanding that Zhou Enlai has ordered RENMIN RIBAO to write about the old American civil war in order to sweeten the beautiful news of Nixon's going to Beijing for the Chinese people. Regardless of the contradictions which it has with the United States of America, Britain's entry into the Common Market is in favour of the American policy in Europe. The acceptance by France of Britain's entry into this organization is not so much to oppose the United States of America, as to balance Bonn's Germany and from fear of an eventual Bonn-Moscow alliance.

Time will verify all these things, but during this period, China is making grave mistakes in principle for which it and the world will pay a heavy price. We must try, if we have the possibility, to stop this adventurous course of China. The letter which we are preparing for the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China is one of these attempts. This letter may cost us dear, but we must make no concessions over principles. We must defend the Marxist-Leninist principles of our party to the end.

The Soviet-Indian Treaty and China

Exposing the China's opportunist policy towards the development of the events of the time in Asia, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes among others in the note dated: Durrës, Friday, August 13, 1971:

China began approaches to Pakistan, obviously as a counter-weight to India. This was a correct state policy of China and this policy continues, but I think that it should not go beyond all bounds and consider all the actions of the Khan of Pakistan correct and supportable. It is not in order for a socialist state, Comrade Enver Hoxha stresses, in its policy with the other states, to forget the main idea of assisting the peoples to liberate themselves from internal and foreign bondage. East Pakistan rose against the Khan. The oppressed population there rose in revolt under the leadership of Rahman, for Bangladesh. There were armed clashes. Does Indian reaction have a finger in this? Of course it does. But to declare oneself immediately pro-Khan and to make a commitment that, if Pakistan is attacked by India, China will come to the aid of Pakistan, means to make common cause with the Khan, notwithstanding that from the state angle, the Khan will defend the borders of his state. But the question of the Bengalis and of the whole Indian people is a very important one. In our opinion, China has ignored this great problem in an arbitrary manner.

Despite the well-known stands of Nehru, Bahadur Shastri and Indira Gandhi, as far as we know, China did not make any effort to improve its relations with India, with the major objective of neutralizing the Soviet-American influence there. The Chinese who like to pose as patient, did not display this quality here but displayed the opposite. To take the side of one Khan (who is also linked by treaty with the United States of America) against another Khan, and to consider this stand "the diplomacy of the people," doesn't make sense. Your friend Khan will leave you in the lurch whenever he likes, but the people will not do this if you really develop a policy for the people.

Is it permissible for China to pursue such a policy of refusing to approach India? In my opinion, no. When China is making all these concessions to Nixon, the head of American imperialism, the maintenance of such a stand towards India is astonishing. Meanwhile the Soviets have acted skilfully. They signed the Soviet-Indian treaty and strengthened their positions in India, told Indian reaction and the "Indian people": "don't fear either China or the United States of America, because if anyone attacks you we shall enter the war on your side." The treaty of which we spoke, concluded at this time, tells the world that it "was signed against the Sino-American alliance which is in the wind." On the other side, China now finds itself officially encircled by war treaties: by the old treaties of SEATO and CENTO, etc., and now by this Soviet-Indian treaty. The "wise policy" of Mao and Zhou Enlai of opening towards the United States of America and their "diplomacy of the people" precipitated this.

The encirclement of China will be extended. The day after Gromyko left Delhi, the foreign minister of India, Singh, left for Jakarta to reach agreement with the Indonesian fascists. It is said that China sent a person to Malaysia as a counter-weight. What a miserable, incoherent, pragmatic policy, an opportunist subjective policy of people who have lost their bearings in the flow of events.

[13 Jul 79]

[Text] Tirana, July 13 (ATA)--Chinese Policy in the Balkans and in Europe is Not on the Correct Marxist-Leninist Course

In the note dated: Durres, Sunday August 15, 1971, Comrade Enver Hoxha exposes the incorrect policy of the Chinese in the Balkans and in Europe. Their policy in the Balkans and in Europe, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha, is "friendship with all those who are in opposition to the Soviets," without asking who they are, whether they are pro-Americans, Titoites, etc., for them this has no importance. This policy is without perspective and is not on the correct Marxist-Leninist course.

The Indian-Pakistani War and China

In the note of Thursday, December 30, 1971, which appears under the above title, Comrade Enver Hoxha once more writes about the markedly liberal-opportunist Chinese policy.

The markedly liberal-opportunist Chinese policy of recent times, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes, was undertaken by the group of Zhou Enlai in great euphoria (on the basis of what Zhou Enlai said when he informed us of the invitation of Nixon to go to China). However, it could not and did not turn out like this. It seems as if international events have been arranged to weaken China. Nixon's coming meetings are being propagated by imperialism as "giving hopes for peace" and China is going to these meetings not "internally strong," and not prepared to cope with major problems in the international arena either.

The imperialists and revisionists are putting pressure on China, on the one hand, they are threatening it with provocations, with war, and on the other hand, coming out with "olive branches," with proposals of "talks," of "clearing things up." Both of them will keep their finger on the internal pulse of China, both of them will work, will provoke, will make promises and threats, will smile for their individual interests and for their common counterrevolutionary interests.

If that sound, strong, clear, Marxist-Leninist situation which we spoke of does not exist and is not created in China, there are great dangers there. Only great political and ideological clarity, iron organization, a Marxist-Leninist policy and a steel-like unity can withstand internal and external dangers.

The Communist Party of China Is in Revisionist Positions

Is the title of the note dated Sunday, February 13, 1972.

The Chinese, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha in this note, pose as anti-imperialists, they pose as if they fight the two imperialist superpowers, but actually they are developing their contacts and collaboration with the United States of America against the Soviets. Allegedly they are exploiting the contradictions. They do not say explicitly that the Soviets are the number one enemy of mankind, but they imply that the United States of America is no longer the number one enemy.

Tomorrow, in new circumstances, the roles may be changed. The thing is, that by following a non-principled policy, and allegedly exploiting the contradictions and temporary circumstances, China cannot consolidate itself as a powerful socialist country, and the Communist Party of China cannot consolidate itself as a dauntless Marxist-Leninist party which defends principles. On the contrary, the current policy of China is being developed from a revisionist standpoint, which means that the Communist Party of China is in a revisionist position, therefore the policy which it follows cannot be the genuine policy of a socialist state.

This worries us immensely, and our greatest worry is for the whole of mankind.

In the note of Monday, April 17, 1972, Comrade Enver Hoxha severely criticizes the vacillations and uncertainty of China in its foreign policy. The note is entitled:

A Talk of Zhou Enlai Without Political Problems

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

It is not normal thing for Zhou Enlai not to deal with political matters in a talk with one of our comrades. Did he have political problems of first-rate importance which he should have dealt with? Yes.

A) The relations with the United States of America are new relations. We think that he should have said how far, or in what direction, these relations will be developed. Zhou Enlai may hide behind the pretext that "since you were against Nixon's visit to China and ignored this visit, why then is it necessary that we should inform you about it?" Fair enough, we were opposed to this visit, but now that it has been made we are interested to know what has been achieved from it and how the Chinese intend to develop their policy with the United States of America in the future. We have the right to ask such a thing, because we are the allies of China. The Chinese comrades may say: "You were informed through the Sino-American communique, and after this our policy regarding the United States of America has not altered." Although this is not so (because the coming and going of personalities of the two countries continues, not to mention what is being discussed and achieved between them, because these are secret discussions). It is still up to them to tell us because earlier we were told officially that "what we are doing with Nixon is a new tactic and a major strategy." Hence Zhou Enlai remained completely silent on this major problem because his positions are weak and he would have had to make certain denials or admissions about which he is not sure, therefore he remained prudent. But his prudence shows the hesitation and uncertainty in the policy which China is pursuing with the United States of America. The main tactical and strategic objectives which were to be achieved are not becoming visible either in China or in the international arena. We think that in the international arena this political action of China towards the United States of America did not bring it anything but harm.

B) The problem of Vietnam. There, the great military offensive by the Vietnamese side has begun. The Americans and their puppets are receiving heavy blows. This is a major victory not only for the Vietnamese people but for all of us. Our policy has been and is that the Americans must be driven out of Vietnam. We support Vietnam in this direction.

However, Zhou Enlai was silent about the victories of the Vietnamese people in this war. Why? Because relations between the Chinese and the Vietnamese are not good, and there is no doubt about this, because of the course the Chinese are following towards Nixon, whom, the Vietnamese rightly call the greatest war criminal. The Chinese who played host to Nixon, met him and

talked with him. The war of the Vietnamese has put the Chinese in a difficult position. This means: "While I am shedding my blood, you accept my murderer as a friend and talk with him." China made official statements and in the communique which the two sides signed affirmed that it "would not talk with Nixon about the war in Vietnam." This was a major political and strategic mistake on its part. The Chinese may say that "the Vietnamese did not want" us to talk about them with the Americans. Irrespective of this, China should not have left this question in silence, as it did. The Soviet revisionists benefited from this and now they are posing as "the main inspirers and supporters of the Vietnamese offensive."

Hence Zhou Enlai was silent about Vietnam, too, because the policy with Nixon has shut his mouth.

C) China's policy towards Pakistan and Bangladesh suffered a fiasco. What could Zhou say? About the Middle East and Europe he was completely silent, as in the Sino-American communique.

D) He did not make the slightest mention of the Soviet revisionists, either. Why?

In the note of Saturday, April 22, 1972, Comrade Enver Hoxha condemns the stand of the Chinese towards Vietnam. The note appears under the title:

The Vietnamese Offensive and China

The change in the strategy and tactics of China, and especially towards the United States of America, has made China alter its main aims.

In connection with Vietnam, China was opposed to the talks of the Vietnamese with the Americans in Paris and considered them to be in vain. When China itself entered into secret talks with the United States of America, it changed its stand on this question. The Vietnamese in Paris proposed their 7-point program, the Americans proposed theirs. This was the time the agreement on Nixon's going to China was announced. Precisely from this time on, the Americans did not give much more importance to the conference in Paris. Why? There is no doubt, it must be thought that Nixon was going to talk about Vietnam in Beijing, and there are reasons why it must have been so. The North Vietnamese...certainly quarrelled with the Chinese, to the extent that Zhou Enlai was obliged to declare publicly that "the question of Vietnam would not be touched on with Nixon." Here lies the source of the conflict.

However, this conflict must have taken place within the Chinese leadership, too. That is, between Mao and Zhou Enlai on the one side, and Lin Biao and the army-men, or the "extreme leftists," as they have described them, on the other side.

However, the situation between China and Vietnam appears to be unhealthy. The Soviet revisionists and the American imperialists are benefiting from this situation to the detriment of the Vietnamese people, who are fighting heroically. It is our duty to support their just struggle with all our strength.

In the note dated: Vlora, Sunday, December 17, 1972, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes about some conclusions he has drawn from the minutes taken by the comrades of the Albanian military delegation in their talk with Zhou Enlai in Beijing. The note is entitled:

Reading the Minutes of a Talk With Zhou Enlai

The picture which Zhou Enlai presented about the problems of foreign policy, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, was not something "brilliant," although spun out at considerable length. At first, when I read the minutes, I had the impression that he was speaking to our comrades, but in fact he was also speaking to the gallery, to the Chinese comrades whom he had invited to the meeting. The problems which he raised were known to us, there was no originality about the content of what he said, and neither was the future respective of the international policy of China apparent in all its breadth.

The small peoples, continues Comrade Enver Hoxha, want the superpowers to be exposed and hindered in their activity. If concessions are made to relations with them, allegedly in order to balance or counter-balance them, then, you lose the interest and trust of the peoples, because they see the governments of their countries performing such acrobat's tricks everyday to escape the grip of the big powers.

China is showing publicly that it has nuances in its foreign policy, at least in its propaganda against the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Zhou Enlai himself said: "We hit hardest at the Soviets, because they are more deceptive, since they pose as socialists, while the American imperialists have been exposed for what they are." This may or may not be true, but to proclaim this and to discriminate between them in practice is not right, because in this way the two superpowers will fight you with the weapon you give them yourself. In this case, the Soviet revisionists say: "China is against socialism," "it is united with the American policy," and in fact, the very differentiation which China makes publicly today, in saying that the number one enemy is the Soviet Union and then comes the United States of America, puts it on the side of the latter.

In regard to the policy which China is pursuing towards the United States of America, Zhou Enlai said almost nothing, perhaps, knowing our views, or did not want to reveal the "provisional approaches to relations," which may burst into flower after "peace is signed in Vietnam." I think that Zhou Enlai did not speak on this point for both these reasons.

Zhou Enlai's view in connection with the perspective of the war in Vietnam reinforces this opinion. He said that the Soviet Union is giving Vietnam little aid. This is true, but to give Vietnam little aid means to weaken its defence. Zhou Enlai was of the opinion that the Soviet Union wants the war in Vietnam to continue. Here there is a contradiction in that "on the one hand, you do not help the Vietnamese, and on the other hand, you want the war to continue." The Soviets may want the war in Vietnam to continue, they may want the United States of America to remain tied up in this war, to hinder China from strengthening its "friendship with the United States of America," so that it continues not to have diplomatic relations with the USA, and the question of Taiwan and the "stationing" of the U.S. 7th Fleet in Chinese waters to remain unresolved."

The Soviets are making all these plans, which are in their interest, but such a thing is not really in conformity with what they are doing, with their failure to assist Vietnam with weapons. Of course, the Soviets, in alliance with the Americans, have many variants of plans in their satchels, which they keep up to date, link and coordinate with all the world problems into which they have poked their noses.

Zhou Enlai scarcely mentioned the problems of Europe and the Middle East, and this was not because he does not have his own opinions about the major problems which are boiling up there. China is continuing a policy of little interest in these zones and, in my opinion, this is a mistake, because the solution of the political and military problems in these countries has major consequences for the countries of Asia. It is precisely here, in Europe and the Near and Middle East, that the two superpowers are trying to find a common language, to consolidate their alliance and to have their hands free for other regions, at least, for a period. To pursue a passive policy, as China is doing, at these moments and over these regions, is not a far-sighted policy.

[14 Jul 79]

[Text] Tirana July 14 (ATA)--A considerable number of materials included in the first volume of Comrade Enver Hoxha's book "Reflections on China" are devoted to the analysis of the so-called Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the time when the deviations of Mao Zedong and the C.P. of China from the teachings of Marxism-Leninism with regard to a number of capital questions on the internal development in China began to be manifested in acute forms, though disguised under ultra-revolutionary phraseology.

In the note of Tuesday, August 9, 1966, Comrade Enver Hoxha makes a stern principled criticism of the unprecedented exaggeration of the cult of Mao Zedong. The note is entitled:

The Cult of Mao Zedong

Marx condemned the cult of the individual as something sickening.

However, we see with regret that in recent months, in regard to this question in particular, the Chinese comrades have set out on a wrong anti-Marxist course. In reality they are turning the cult of Mao almost into a religion, exalting him in a sickening way, without giving the least consideration to the great harm this is doing to the cause, not to mention the ridicule it gives rise to, because, in fact, such a great clamour is being made, with such high-falutin terms that all this seems to be contrived, is becoming an anachronism, impermissible for us Marxists and unacceptable for our time.

We condemn this unrestrained, abnormal, non-Marxist propaganda. The fact is that our criticism over this question, which we made to Zhou Enlai the last time he was here, had no effect at all. Indeed, it seems to me that our comradely criticism must have been distasteful to the Chinese comrades. But nothing can shake us from our position of saying what is right and defending it.

Wanting to bring out the merits of Mao, the Chinese comrades have obscured the role of the masses, obscured the role of their party, not to mention the role of their Central Committee, which simply "doesn't exist" in comparison with the personality of Mao. They have replaced Marxism-Leninism with "Mao Zedong Thought." Indeed the Chinese propaganda gives the impression that it wants to say that Marx and Lenin are allegedly a hindrance to the "fame of Mao." Therefore they are being mentioned by name as little as possible. I believe I am not mistaken when I say that the Chinese propaganda is making every effort to inculcate in the people the idea that when one speaks and thinks about Marxism-Leninism one should have in mind "Mao Zedong Thought." Hence, according to this propaganda, "there is no need to refer to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, but only to Mao Zedong Thought." How can such ideas be accepted as Marxist-Leninist judgments?

The question arises: Why all this unrestrained propaganda? I cannot explain this otherwise than as the deafening beating of the drum which conceals some hostile work, either immediately or in the long term.

Nikita Khrushchev fabricated the question of "Stalin's cult of the individual" for his own treacherous purposes. He slandered and slandered him to such an extent that "something would stick" in people's minds.

His lack of restraint of the Chinese propaganda about Mao is really fostering the Khrushchevite propaganda, although it creates the impression that it is opposed to it.

As we see it, such unrestrained propaganda assumed proportions alarming to us Marxist-Leninists, especially after the cultural revolution began and the anti-party work of Peng Chen and his associates was disclosed.

In China there is talk about the dictatorship of the proletariat, about the class struggle, but when it comes to what should be done with these major participants in this plot, such as Peng Chen and company, we do not see anything serious, Marxist-Leninist, being done. The main one, Peng Chen, has not even been named anywhere. He still remains a member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee, just as before, together with Peng Teh-huai and a number of others. The other plotters have been removed from the posts they had, have been exposed, and have been made to wear the "dunce's cap" for their reeducation. No trial is being held of these plotters who wanted to bury the regime and Mao.

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha stresses:

Can it be that the modern revisionists who are still concealed, who now have drawn up their legs to cover their tracks, are inspiring this unrestrained propaganda of the cult of Mao with the intention of escaping today as "ardent Maoists," in order to fight better tomorrow against the party and Mao himself, as Khrushchev did against Marxism-Leninism, Stalin, the Soviet Union and international communism? We are thinking about this and suspect it may be so. As it seems, the Chinese comrades are not sensing such a danger.

In the Cultural Revolution Which Is Going on in China We Observe Certain Things Which Make an Impression

In this cultural revolution which is going on in China we observe certain things which make an impression. The main issue is that "proletarian culture begins and ends in China," "nothing else in the world is any good." For the Chinese propaganda, the positive and progressive aspects of human thought have no value at all, only the "ideas" of Mao Zedong and everything which comes from Chinese hands is of value. Such spirit, and this is the direction in which things in China are heading, is not healthy and contains great dangers, just as the excessive persecution of the intellectuals there might have repercussions, which reminds us of the actions of the Yugoslavs and their agent Koci Xoxe against intellectuals in our country in order allegedly to defend the "proletarian nucleus," as Koci Xoxe put it.

The Chinese comrades who, in many things, show themselves "cautious," "slow to move," who have made "reeducation" a principle, who have the theory of "a hundred flowers" and "a hundred schools," have now begun to attack things with big axes. We agree that the axe should fall where it is necessary and with great force, we agree that the broom, indeed a big broom, must be applied, but, as we see it, at least from the propaganda that is coming out, the broom is sweeping away every work, every literary creation, regardless of the overall progressive spirit of the work, the time at which it was written and the role it has played in those circumstances. While as for progressive world literature and progressive culture in general, for the Chinese comrades this has no value at all, it is barren country to them.

All these things are not on the right road and damage our great cause.

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha continues:

Up till yesterday there was the slogan of "a hundred flowers" and "a hundred schools." How was it applied and what results did it yield? Was it understood correctly? Were there mistakes in its concept and application? This is not being said by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. Does the hostile activity of Peng Chen and company have its source in these directives? Have they disguised themselves under this slogan? This is not being said. Perhaps the Chinese comrades have reached conclusions and we know nothing about this. However, we see that the students in China have taken the bit between their teeth and are hitting out wherever they can, up to the point that the police have to intervene to calm things down and clear the ground. It seems to me that this is not correct.

To attack, to denounce, to call even progressive things reactionary, simply because they are old, and to do this at revolutionary and progressive moments for your people, for the history of your people, is very wrong.

To allow the students to attack and denounce all the old intellectuals and scientists without exception, this too is very wrong.

To allow the students to display a terrible xenophobia, as is being done in China, means to make a great mistake which has nothing at all to do with proletarian internationalism, means not knowing how to distinguish between the peoples of the world and imperialism and world capitalism, between the progressive and the reactionary.

As to whether there was a need for a great shakeup there, in my opinion, underlines Comrade Enver Hoxha, there was such a need. But the shakeup ought to be well-studied, organized, guided, and continuous and neither an earthquake, nor a flash in the pan.

To begin a cultural revolution by attacking the revisionists, Peng Chen and company, without a clear document being issued by the Central Committee of the party on how this revolution is to be carried out, seems to me not in order.

To solicit the opinion of five students on how the future school programs in China should be, seems to me not at all correct, regardless of whether these five, or a hundred, are inspired from above. This is formalism. The Central Committee must formulate and present the experience of the masses for discussion by all the working people, and then let the students give their opinion, even millions of them.

I base these ideas of mine about what is occurring in China at present on those materials which the Chinese press is publishing. Naturally, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has its own decisions,

its own more comprehensive tactics. Not knowing what these are, possibly I am wrong in my estimate of the situation in China. Time will make everything clear to us.

In the note of Saturday, August 20, 1966, dwelling on the situation in China at that time, Comrade Enver Hoxha expresses serious reservations and doubt about the so-called cultural revolution. The note is entitled:

What Is Going on in China?

A great puzzle--astonishing events, dangerous to the great cause of communism, which worry us immensely, are taking place, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha. We have a problem with many unknown factors to solve, we have to try to see clearly into this dark Chinese forest. With Marxist judgment and with the numerous, but at the same time very fragmentary data of the official Chinese press which we have, we shall try to arrive at certain guiding conclusions which are so necessary and essential to our party, to our future stand.

The problem began with the proletarian cultural revolution against bourgeois elements in the field of culture, who had infiltrated the party and the state, and against bourgeois culture in all its aspects. In this direction this revolution had to be carried through to the end.

Of course, the methods to carry this revolution through to the end may differ, and likewise the tactics for carrying out this revolution, in connection with internal and external factors. But such a very complicated, very delicate revolution must be inspired by the Marxist-Leninist ideology, must be organized and guided by the party, and there must never be any smell of mysticism, metaphysics and idealism, either in its essence, its forms or its tactics, because then it is no longer a proletarian cultural revolution, but its opposite, regardless of how it is advertised, and regardless of whether the masses of hundreds of millions strong are set in motion.

In my opinion, this cultural revolution in China did not begin in the way a serious party, which has its feet on the ground, ought to have begun it. The army touched it off, then the Peking University, and later its flames spread everywhere. The Chinese propaganda presented this as a revolution launched from below, by the revolutionary masses, and said that it developed in a "spontaneous" way, but in reality it is organized. But by whom? We shall try to answer this later, because it is difficult to do so now. However, we must say that now emerges the figure of Lin Biao, the leader of the army, who has been sick for years on end and likewise for years on end, in practice, has been replaced by Luo Ruizen, an "enemy" and a member of the "black gang." Lin Biao comes out with an article which says, "Everyone should read and study the works of Mao Zedong, and these must guide us." This article became the pivot and the banner of the cultural revolution and the struggle against the "black gang."

The question arises: How is it possible, and is it in order and Marxist-Leninist that for such a cultural revolution one person of the Political Bureau and the Central Committee, even if he is minister of defence, or the first secretary, or the chairman of the party himself, should become the standard-bearer while the party and its Central Committee remain in the shade? No, this is not in order, this is not Marxist-Leninist. Only the Central Committee of the party can take such decisions and actions. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China did not issue the call for this cultural revolution, nor did it lead it. The call was issued by others. The revolution was developed in spontaneity and disorder, and this was called the "revolutionary method." Only now, several months after the beginning of the revolution was the Central Committee finally met (the 11th plenum, after four years scandal) and issued a "set of rules" about how the cultural revolution should be carried out.

Certain Preliminary Conclusions

From the manner in which this cultural revolution was launched, Comrade Enver Hoxha continues, the public facts make one think that this method of action was imposed on the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, because it took decisions and came out with resolutions on how this revolution should be guided much later, several months after it broke out.

Why did it happen that way? Here lies the mystery, and for the moment this cannot be explained. It is a fact that since 1956, when the 8th congress of the Communist Party of China was held, more than five years have gone by since the time when its 9th congress should have been summoned. Why is this? It is difficult to explain. Normally, each Marxist-Leninist party holds at least two plenums of the Central Committee a year. The recent plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China was held after four years' delay. Then who is leading the party? Is the congress leading it? Is the Central Committee leading it between congresses? It seems that these forums have been displaced from leadership. It seems that the Political Bureau of the CC of certain main individuals are leading. Do these individuals at least lead in a collective way and do they adhere to the norms of the party. Or do they have unlimited "authority" for everything, and decide the interval of time between congresses and plenums as they please? We cannot pronounce ourselves on this, but we see that enemies such as Peng Teh-huai and Peng Chen remain in the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. Other comrades in the Political Bureau, in the Central Committee and outside it, have been doing a thousand and one things, which are now finally being revealed, and on account of this, the cultural revolution begins against them. Their activity has been described as a great conspiracy intended to direct socialist China on to the revisionist course, the capitalist course, and to replace the ideas of Mao Zedong, etc. If this is such a conspiracy, if this conspiracy had been hatched up in the army and everywhere, this is no longer a "cultural," "ideological," conspiracy, but first of all, a political conspiracy.

The Chinese comrades are striving at all costs to avoid describing it in this way, as it is in reality. When I said to Zhou Enlai, after his exposition (which was very general in connection with the participants in this conspiracy) that Peng Chen and company were agents of imperialism and the capitalists, he jumped up saying: "I have never described them in this way in the exposition I made to you."

From these things we can draw certain preliminary conclusions: since the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China meets once in four years, the Chinese leadership is not in order, it has violated the norms of the party, the norms of democratic centralism, the norms of collective leadership. The Political Bureau of the Central Committee has set aside the leading role of the Central Committee, has taken away its authority. And in the Political Bureau itself unrestricted individual leadership has prevailed, uncontrolled, or very weakly controlled, even by Mao Zedong himself. The fact is that in this whole business of propagating Mao's ideas only his old writings are mentioned, and the quotations too, are drawn from his old writings. There are no new ones.

Has Comrade Mao exercised effective leadership since the last congress in 1956, or has he just been asked "in passing" and only "given inspiration?" This we do not know concretely. But I suspect that, wittingly or unwittingly, such a method of work not on the Marxist course has left Mao on the sidelines and has turned him into a mere symbol. The work has gone on outside the party rules, hence there must not have been unity of thought and action there. The enemies, careerists, factionists, and what have you, have taken advantage of this. A number of capital ideological and political stands clearly indicate this unhealthy situation, in the recording of which we are not mistaken because they are known.

1. They were very late in commencing a resolute struggle against the modern revisionists. They did not defend our party directly for a long time. Why? For tactical reasons? No. But because of ideological hesitations, vacillations. Of course, this major problem was not raised in the Central Committee, and hence the comrades of the Political Bureau reflected their vacillation in their stands, and whenever a decision for action was taken, it was only a lame one.
2. Khrushchev fell and the Chinese comrades abruptly decided to go to Moscow to settle matters. Zhou Enlai's scandalous action towards us is known.
3. Their line of the "anti-imperialist front included even the modern revisionists." After six or seven months they abandoned this position and took the opposite position, the correct one.
4. The Communist Party of Indonesia, which was hit so hard by reaction, was not defended at all by the Chinese press and propaganda; it was ignored. Why? This is a very serious problem.

All these things and many others make me conclude what I said earlier, that in the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China there is no unity, no collective work, and the work in non-Marxist ways has weakened the party, weakened the Central Committee and has permitted many evils, which were disguised with many excuses and happenings, but which developed and inevitably brought about a rotten state of affairs.

Even when this hostile work was discovered, the struggle against it was not waged, and is still not being waged, in the correct party way, in the Marxist-Leninist way. Therefore, this raises great doubts. Instead of being waged by the party, this struggle is being waged by the "revolutionary committees," which, as is known, are not controlled and led by the party, but everything is done and led in the name of the unrestrained cult of the individual of Mao Zedong, the "Works of Mao Zedong," the "quotations of Mao Zedong," up to "Mao Zedong's Swims."

Recently the name of the party has been completely overshadowed by the name of Mao Zedong. "Mao Zedong has done everything," "his ideas guide everything," the party exists thanks to these "ideas," "without Mao there is no party, no socialism." And all these terrible distortions (you only need to read XINHUA to find them) are being made in Mao's presence. Mao approves them. Why? This is astonishing.

Who has set up all this colossal work on this wrong and dangerous course with major consequences?

It turns out that the main leaders of this revolution are Mao Zedong, Lin Biao and Zhou Enlai.

On the other hand, we see that the order of listing the leaders, an order which was a taboo for the Chinese, has now changed. After Zhou Enlai, the director of the propaganda is ranked fourth, while Liu Shaoqi has moved from second place to eighth, and Chu Teh has been shifted from fourth to nearly last, and so on.... This indicates that there have been differences, factions and debates in the Central Committee.

On the basis of these actions and knowing Zhou Enlai too, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, I am afraid that there may exist a strong group with him at the head, which is manoeuvring in non-Marxist ways.

Further on, Comrade Enver Hoxha points out: The modern revisionists have all sorts of arrows which they use, both short range and long range.

The fact is that in order to fight the Chinese comrades and to strengthen their own allegedly correct thesis against the "cult of Stalin," the Soviet and other modern revisionists need only reprint in their newspapers what the Chinese press is saying about Mao. But they are not raising this question. Why? Because it is to their advantage and on their line, if not today, tomorrow they could have the Chinese as their friends, though they appear to be acting in opposition to them on the "question of the cult." But, in reality, in their ideology and aims, they are in agreement.

[15 Jul 79]

[Text] Tirana, July 15 (ATA)--Comrade Enver Hoxha analyses at length the 16-point document issued by the plenum of the C.C. of the CP of China on the cultural revolution. The note dealing with this problem is dated: Friday, August 26, 1966 and appears under the title:

A Sixteen-Point Document on the Cultural Revolution Is Approved

Today, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, I read a sixteen-point document on the cultural revolution which the recent plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China issued.

From reading this document, we can draw certain conclusions about the situation in the Communist Party of China and in its leadership at all levels, as well as about the extent of the danger of the influence of bourgeois culture in the People's Republic of China.

This implies to us that the enemy had infiltrated the party deeply, to the point that it had taken over the whole leaderships of party committees. It emerges as a logical deduction that not only has the organizational and political work in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China been unsound, but there have been opposing lines, deviations and factions there, as I have said earlier, and these factionist elements have been operating freely for a long time. Many leaders at the centre and the base, irrespective of who they are, have degenerated ideologically and politically and have set out on a hostile course.

There is one thing that worries me. Although the sixteen-point document differs from the communique of the plenum, in which it came out clearly that the personality of Mao dominated the party, again in this case, the role of the Central Committee comes out as weak, although it is the Central Committee which brought out this sixteen-point document, and the role of the party and its call to take this situation in hand is likewise weak.

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

Another incorrect thing strikes the eye in this cultural revolution: the school pupils and students hold the initiative in it and are its standard-bearers. The youth organization is not to be seen anywhere. But what is more serious still, there is no sign of the participation of the working class. It seems as if they are afraid of it. This is astonishing. It is not entering the battle, let alone the peasantry.

Is it possible to imagine the cultural revolution without the participation of the working class and the peasantry? Of course not. But the fact is that it is stated that the cultural revolution will be extended to the countryside later.

However, many points of the document, while not putting the finger right on the sore spot, clearly imply that other main leaders, or factional groups, exist in China, who either will come out as "corrected," or will be openly attacked later. The classification which is made of cadres is characteristic. It does not emerge concretely from this classification who are included as the main ones in each category, instead this is left to the imagination.

We also see something new in this cultural revolution: the creation of groups, committees, congresses of the cultural revolution. It is said that these are to be led by the party. This is a new form which we must watch to see how it develops and what influence it will have in the solution of this great problem. However, if this work is not rigorously under the leadership of the party, then it will be carried out by a new organism, parallel with the party, and will take over one of its main functions, that of leadership in the field of ideology and the cultural revolution in general.

Conciliatory, Soft and Opportunist Policy Towards Bourgeoisie

Although power appears to be in the hands of the proletariat, it is possible that the bourgeois is still powerful and dangerous. The Chinese comrades themselves say this when they put the question: Which will win in China, socialism or capitalism? The presentation of the problem in such a categorical manner, without defining where socialism has triumphed and where it has not triumphed, and where the bourgeoisie remains strong, has astounded us.

Many times the Chinese comrades have told us, of course, while belittling this force, that they have about 50 million enemies in China. Regardless of the fact that China has 700 million inhabitants, this enemy force is not small. Moreover, this colossal hostile force has certainly not sat and is not sitting with folded arms, but is working and exerting influence, fighting and sabotaging. This hostile force has not felt the powerful fist of the dictatorship of the proletariat to the extent it should have, either in ideology or in the economy, except up to a point in the economic field in the countryside. Industry too, in China is declared to be socialist, but we see that the capitalists and the industrialists in enterprises still receive a set rent. In fact this should not have been permitted, while the Chinese leaders have permitted it and still permit it. But at the time when the Chinese have permitted the paying of this rent, all these capitalists continued to be in the possession of large amounts of liquid assets, which have not been touched at all. Such a tolerant stand towards exploiters naturally has been associated with a soft and opportunist conciliatory policy towards them. All this "coexistence" has been covered with the campaign of "reeducation" from Pu Yi, the emperor of Manchukuo down to the old industrialists.

Instead of receiving crushing blows, all these enemies were "placed in suitable jobs," "educated," and thus adapted themselves to the policy of the

socialist state. In the new conditions, their hostile work was carried on in new forms in all sectors, but especially in propaganda and ideology.

The "Red Guard"

On Thursday, September 1, 1966, Comrade Enver Hoxha dwells on the character of the "Red Guard." He writes among others:

What this "guard" is in fact and why it is being created is not very clear to us. It is said that it is carrying out the cultural revolution all over China, that it "has been created to carry out a radical purge of the old culture, of the capitalist and revisionist bourgeois culture." The beginning of this work is anarchic and confused.

Certain serious things strike the eye right at the start:

1. The "Red Guard" is made up mainly of youth, university students, middle school pupils, and now their teachers have united with them. The members of the "Red Guard" are only citizens. Since this cultural revolution has a pan-Chinese character, not to say any more of it (because the Chinese propaganda wants to give and is giving the revolution this tendency), it cannot be restricted to the students, and led by them alone, because this creates the impression that this revolution belongs to the students alone, and that "they are capable of carrying it out and leading it."
2. If we speak about proletarian culture, it is a very surprising matter that the working class and the peasantry, or at least, the worker and peasant youth (since they want to give the revolution the colour of the younger generation) are sitting as onlookers and not taking part in this revolution. Whatever the Chinese comrades may say, nothing explains this equivocal stand. In socialism, culture is not an adornment of only one stratum, but belongs to the whole people, and if one has to have one's say about culture and art, it is the workers and peasants who should have their say before anyone else. How is it possible that neither the thought nor the action of the working class and the peasantry is being sought on such a major issue? How can this occur when the school and university youth, allegedly, have the right of entry everywhere, to make the law, to set the orientation in this revolution, and for its leadership to be taken over precisely by that stratum which has made the mistakes, and which, from its very nature, is in a vacillating position? Only the proletarian reinforced concrete can make this antibourgeois and antirevisionist wall impregnable, and if it requires the "iron broom" to clean up the filth, there can be no such broom without iron, that is, without the working class.
3. If we say that the "Red Guard" is made up of the youth down to the Young Pioneers, then what has become of the communist youth, at one time a famous organization in China? Its voice is not being heard at all. It seems as if it does not exist, or is on the point of "fading out,"

What has the "Red Guard" done concretely for the cultural revolution up till now?

The only concrete thing which the "Red Guard" does is: It defends Mao Zedong and cheers him to the sky, it regards him as a god in the full sense of the term. Why are the street signs smashed and people forced to have their hair cut? Such an action does not seem like a cultural revolution.

The way this cultural revolution is proceeding, we cannot see clearly where it will end up, and apart from this, the truly revolutionary measures which ought to be taken against enemies, whether inside or outside the party, have been very much neglected, and the most essential organizational norms of the party have been violated. From the speech which Zhou Enlai delivered in Tiananmen Square the day before yesterday it is apparent that he is the main one in all this situation, regardless of the fact that it is Lin Biao that is being publicized. His speech was a program of work for the "Red Guard."

In China today everything revolves around the cultural revolution and the clamour of the "Red Guard," as if there were no other problems, as if the Central Committee which met had only to decide on the famous sixteen points. It seems that this noisy business is to continue and will be used against someone for something. Astounding methods.

The "Red Guards" Are Acting Without Leadership or Control

Is the title of the note of Tuesday, September 20, 1966.

The true purpose of the "Red Guard" movement, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, remains unknown to us, regardless of the fact that the official Chinese propaganda says that it was created to carry out the cultural revolution. The fact is that the "Red Guards" in China are acting without leadership or control, the "Red Guard" continues to exist. We shall see how it will work in the future, how it will be organized and what form it will take, or will it melt away like snow flakes in water?

In my opinion, on the basis of the obvious things, this "inflation" of, this clamour about, these competences and the epithets that are ascribed to the "Red Guard" could not continue for long, otherwise great doubts would be aroused about the issue. This gives the impression that there is nothing in China, apart from the "Red Guard" and Mao, Lin Biao and Zhou Enlai. These four are above all, make the law, make the rain fall and the sun shine.

Our Stand Towards Current Events in China

With the violent performances of the "Red Guard," the cultural revolution has come out of its framework and assumed more the appearance of a political revolution, reads the note of Friday, September 23, 1966.

Hence, up till now, this cultural revolution is more clearly assuming the appearance of a violent political revolution against a political counterrevolution, which is not being talked about openly, but which is implied by many directives in newspaper articles. In general, it is said that this revolution is aimed against reactionaries, revisionists and capitalists, who are in the party, in the leadership. A great deal is implied but nothing is stated precisely.

This counterrevolution has a leadership. Who is it? Is it in the head, in the body or in the tail? Who has been the author or authors of this counterrevolutionary conspiracy? How has all this enemy work developed, how was it permitted, and what measures were taken in the last plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China? This is a mystery, here lies the main problem, and this the Chinese comrades are not telling even to us, their loyal friends. Only when we are acquainted with this shall we be able to see clearly, while now we can only make suppositions, surmises.

We have no doubts about our deduction that there are contradictions and fierce conflicts in the leadership of the Communist Party of China. All these events, contradictory events solved in the party way and in the nonparty way, but mostly solved not in the correct party and state way, indicate this.

From what we can see, the tendency of the Chinese comrades is that we and their other friends should follow in step with them, without reflecting, without the smallest effort on their part to explain the essence of the question to us. Of course, this is neither Marxist, nor comradely, nor friendly, therefore we cannot accept it.

There is something dangerous apparent among the Chinese comrades: the tendency that they can do without friends and comrades. In what does this appear? First, they are not keeping us informed about all this major thing which is going on there, second, they lump both their friends and their enemies together. Today they notified us to withdraw for one year our students who are studying in China.

This and other things are not good signs and damage both them and us. Today they demanded the withdrawal of our students, tomorrow they might demand the return of their specialists on the pretext that they must do their physical labour or take part in the cultural revolution under their "leftisms" we see actions which have an unhealthy smell of bad things to come.

In the note of Monday, September 26, 1966, Comrade Enver Hoxha criticizes the putting of the army above the party in China. The note is entitled:

The Army Is Recommended as a Model for All, Even for the Party

All that is occurring in China writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, could be the "doing of army men" with Mao at the head.

For more than a year the Chinese press has been publicizing the army more than it should, although it is trying to do this without making it very obvious. Certain expressions of Mao's which especially attract attention, are appearing in the Chinese press: the army is recommended as a model for all... even for the party. This implies that Mao and the army men behind him are wanting to impose everything of the army, from its education down to its "modesty," on the party, that is, it emerges that "in the army the line of Mao, the ideas of Mao are being applied in a brilliant way, but not in the party and elsewhere."

The fact is that Mao has been isolated from the life of the party and the country, and is informed only by others. Amongst the civilian masses, the party is encountering and struggling with the difficulties, while the army and the army men cannot encounter these difficulties so strongly and intensively. Therefore those who inform Mao have seen these problems to some extent from the outside, have seen only the black side, and have told him of this, hammering them into this head, and have convinced Mao that it was necessary to act, to strike without mercy. Mao has reached the situation where he must have lost confidence in the cadres of the party, and thinks that the army has to take this purge in hand under his direction. He began this purge by setting in movement the students, who were turned into "Red Guards," initiating the cultural revolution which was turned into a political revolution under the leadership of Mao and Lin Biao, backed up by the army.

[16 Jul 79]

[Text] Tirana, July 16 (ATA)--Comrade Enver Hoxha makes a stern principled criticism of the replacement of the leadership of the party with the individual leadership of Mao Zedong and the unprecedented exaggeration of his cult. The note of Thursday, October 6, 1966 which deals with this is entitled:

Very Astonishing

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: In the article of the Chinese press the name of the Communist Party of China is being obscured more and more each day in a completely shameless way. The name and role of the party, either in the past or present, is not mentioned at all. The name of the party has been completely replaced with the name of Mao, the cult of Mao, the ideas of Mao.

Everything is being identified with Mao. Mao has done everything and he is presented by the Chinese propaganda as a "god," as "infallible," the lone "polar star." Inside and outside China there must be only Mao and his ideas. Mao has replaced the party, and Mao-Zedong-Thought has replaced Marxism-Leninism. And they present the matter thus either on this road or against it. Now it is emerging clearer that the Chinese army is playing a decisive role in this course. It is with Mao and Mao is with it. It turns out that the army "represents" and "applies" the

line of Mao and the ideas of Mao in the most "correct" way. Therefore, it is "the main ideological and political leader at the present moment," the party and the people are relegated to second place, "the party must learn from and be guided by the army."

From such a presentation of this colossal problem, one cannot but reach the conclusion that in China at present there are two powers, two poles, in struggle: the army with Mao on the one side, and a powerful part of the leadership of the party with "a group of capitalists," as Lin Biao calls them, at the head, on the other side. According to the signs, Liu Shaoqi must be at the head of this group.

In the first place, Comrade Enver Hoxha continues, if Mao's group is right, it should base itself on the party and the people, without excluding the army, but should not ignore the party, or scorn it, or impose itself on the party by means of the army.

In the note on Sunday, October 23, 1966, entitled:

Nothing Is Solved Correctly Without the Party

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: Mao should have mobilized the party against the revisionist factionalists, should have aroused the party and the working class to put the line, the norms, the laws of the dictatorship of the proletariat in order, and that would have been enough. This might have been painful for them too, both for those who had gone to sleep and for those who had acted, but this would have led to a correct and complete solution, and not to patching things up. Either the opportunist line of the 8th congress will be radically changed, or things will proceed lamely.

Only the party can do this, but only in a Marxist-Leninist way, otherwise it is not on the right road.

To fail to put the working class into action in order to correct things on the spot, allegedly because the working class must not be raised "against the party," and on the other hand, to arouse the students to "elect" the party committees for the working class and dictate to it what it should do, this is not at all on the right road. Moreover, if you set the working class in motion, you do not set it against the party, but against revisionists, against their resistance. Is there, or is there not resistance on their part? If there is, then why do you want to hide it and cope with it in a half-pie way?

Nothing can be solved correctly, no correct Marxist-Leninist line can be decided or accepted, without the party, without the working class in the forefront. Any other road leads to mistakes, to things fraught with many dangers for the future.

On Thursday, November 10, 1966, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes about the meeting he had with Kang Shien, who, together with Li Xiannian, had come to Albania at that time to attend the proceedings of the 5th Congress of the PLA. The note is entitled:

Kang Shien's Explanations

Yesterday, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, we had a meeting with Comrade Kang Shien, who gave us some supplementary explanations about the proletarian cultural revolution in China.

From Comrade Kang Shien's exposition it emerges that there were deep ideological differences in the main leadership of the Communist Party of China. There were two, or better, three groups. The group of Mao, that of Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping, and a third group of Peng Chen, Lu Ting-yi, Lo Jui-tsin, etc.

Comrade Kang Shien described Peng Chen as an enemy and disguised agent who had betrayed as early as 1925. Investigations about him are continuing. Peng Chen, with his associates Lu Ting-yi, Lo Jui-tsin, etc., were revisionists, bourgeois capitalist agents who plotted to usurp power in China. Of course, they had a network of their people everywhere, at the centre and at the base, and no doubt in the army too. But Kang Shien did not go deeply into these things. Thus, it turns out that the danger was real and very serious.

Meanwhile the Chinese comrades described Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping as elements with bourgeois capitalist views, not on the scale of the group of Peng Chen, who had violated Mao's directive which they too, had jointly accepted, but had acted in "the working groups and with white terror," trying to suppress the proletarian cultural revolution. Kang Shien said, "These two comrades, although stubborn, recognized their mistakes and made self-criticism, in writing and orally, to the extended Central Committee of the party and remained on the standing committee of the Political Bureau."

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha underlines: Could the Chinese comrades have told us more extensively about their internal problems, and especially, more extensively about the wrong theses of Deng Xiaoping and Liu Shaoqi, whose mistakes we think do not consist only in the "working groups?" We think that they could have talked to us more extensively.

On Friday, December 30, 1966, Comrade Enver Hoxha explains why the party of labour of Albania supported the "Chinese Cultural Revolution." The note is entitled:

The Continuation of the Cultural Revolution in China

We have supported and will support the correct orientation of this Chinese Cultural Revolution, because it is attacking the bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist line of a group of Chinese leaders headed by Liu Shaoqi, Deng Xiaoping, Peng Chen, Peng Teh-Huai, Lo Jui-tsin, Lu Ting-yi and many others. If we take as a basis the main orientations of the cultural revolution, which are against imperialism, against capitalism, against modern revisionism, for the defence of Marxism-Leninism, socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the class struggle, and the line of the

masses, the hostility of this group with Liu Shaoqi at the head becomes obvious. But it is correct that the mistakes or the treachery of these people should be stated openly, so that friends and comrades can judge the issue correctly, so as to strengthen and provide even better arguments for their solidarity in struggle.

There is no doubt that mistakes have been proved in the line of the Communist Party of China on that these mistakes had been left to get worse.

One is obliged to think that in China this hostile work had been ignored for a long time and had consolidated itself.

The Soviet revisionists had pinned great hopes on their comrades, the Chinese revisionists, and now that they are under attack, the Soviets are taking them openly under their protection and calling on them to rise against Mao. This is a life and death struggle, and the Chinese comrades must understand this and carry it through to the end. If they continue to maintain soft, opportunist stands toward the enemies such as they have done up to now, then this is a flash in the pan. This means to imply to the enemy that he should save himself in order to take power later, because, faced with defeat, the enemies are changing tactics, "repenting," "making sincere self-criticism," cheering: "Long Live Mao," and similar manoeuvres.

The Revolution Against Revisionists in China Will Be Protracted

Writing further on about the development of "cultural revolution" in China, Comrade Enver Hoxha points out in the note of Saturday, January 7, 1967:

The resistance of the modern revisionists is being broken, being crushed. Is there still danger? As far as we can judge, we cannot say that the danger has been completely eliminated. The enemy may attempt a desperate last act before death, or may try to avoid the crushing blow, by keeping a low profile till storm blows over. Thus even after the final victory, that is, after the routing of the revisionists, in our opinion, the struggle against them in China will be protracted, stern and consistent. Otherwise, if it proceeds on the opportunist line of "education and reeducation," there are great dangers. The struggle against the class enemy must be merciless, not a struggle on paper and with words, but a real struggle with deeds.

There are rumours that recently some dazibaos [as received] have gone up which say, "Mao has been placed in the minority, and a decision for a certain by-passing of him, from the time he withdrew from the post of president of the republic and was replaced by Liu, was taken for reasons of health, old age," etc. All these things are very interesting, but we must wait on many capital questions, and first of all, on the mistakes in the line of the party.

Without going any further back, from the 8th Congress of the Communist Party of China, the line set must have been decided jointly, hence Mao too, has his responsibility in the mistakes. A new dazibo says that Comrade Mao made self-criticism at the 11th plenum of the Central Committee.

Then, on the basis of these few facts and those reliable data which we had earlier, it turns out that there was a certain pushing aside of Mao from leadership. (When Liri Belishova returned from China and was brainwashed in Moscow by Kozlov, amongst other things, she told Hysni, "You see, the Chinese too, have put Comrade Mao on the sidelines. They do not want to get him involved in these disagreements with the Soviets, therefore we too, should act in this way with Comrade Enver." Or Lo Jui-tsin himself told our ambassador in Peking, "Comrade Mao is old now. We must not tire him. Therefore we have advised him to rest, and do not worry him. Zhou Enlai leads us." To what extent has Mao been pushed aside? How? Since when? We cannot determine these things at the moment but this could be true, both about Mao and about Lin Biao, who, they always tell us, "is very ill."

In fact, then, Liu Shaoqi, Deng Xiaoping, Zhou Enlai, Cheng Li, Lo Jui-tsin, etc. were leading the party, the state and the army.

We Must Support the Correct Objectives of the Cultural Revolution in China

Is the title of the note of Thursday, January 12, 1967. It reads among others: I gave instructions on how we must act in connection with the urgent "proclamation" of 32 revolutionary organizations of Shanghai. As it seems, the Chinese revisionists began the sabotage activity in the economy of the city of Shanghai. They have taken advantage of the wrong line, have had the committee in their hands, have "coexisted well and beautifully with the capitalists." And now, judging the situation desperate, have set themselves in motion. Of course, they have been encouraged also by the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat is not striking them as it ought to, that their leaders, such as Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping and others disguised ones, are still not being struck the final blow. The reactionary Chinese bourgeoisie which has infiltrated the party and the state is acting vigorously.

The urgent "proclamation" of 32 revolutionary organizations of Shanghai has great importance at this stage of the proletarian cultural revolution, because now this revolution is going beyond the bounds of dazibaos and the severity of the dictatorship is coming into action. Hence, it has been decided to strike the reactionary elements physically too, to arrest them, try them and punish them. At last. You have to be naive to think that the revisionists will fold their arms in the face of this defeat. We have an especially great duty at these moments to propagate the fundamental objectives of the proletarian cultural revolution in China in their true light.

In the note of Sunday, January 15, 1967 Comrade Enver Hoxha criticizes the opportunist line pursued by China towards the enemy elements. The note is entitled:

The Party in China Will Strengthen Itself by Radically Cleaning Up the Mistakes in Its Line

It reads among others: The events which occurred in Shanghai and Nanking have been noteworthy events of this month. The strikes and attacks are the result of the hostile work of revisionists and internal reactionaries, who, in complete coordination and encouraged and incited by the modern revisionists, headed by the Soviet revisionists, and by the imperialists, who are whipping up an unrestrained slanderous propaganda, have recently tried to rise and to spread the uprising from Shanghai and Nanking throughout China.

This is what it means to go to sleep for a long time, to follow a soft, opportunist line towards class enemies, to fail to implement the Marxist-Leninist norms in the party in the most rigorous way. During all this time, a period of seventeen years since the proclamation of the People's Republic of China, the opportunist and revisionist elements hid themselves under the label of the line of the party operated freely for their own aims, in complete tranquility, apparently prepared their cadres and occupied the key positions. These cadres weakened and eroded the party and the leadership. From the base to the centre, the cadres were nearly all theirs. Thus the revisionists did what they wanted, prepared to seize power.

[17 Jul 79]

[Text] Tirana, July 17 (ATA)--In continuation of his notes on the events in China, Comrade Enver Hoxha deepens the analysis on the cultural revolution. In the note dated, Sunday, January 29, 1967, he denounces the revisionist methods to seize power.

The Revisionists in China Aim To Seize Power Quietly

From the events which are taking place, and which Comrade Hysni will explain to us fully when he returns from China, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, it turns out that this revolution is, so to say, a revolution which is aimed against a counter-revolution, which had been developing in China over a very long time. Likewise, as it turns out, the camouflaged bourgeois-revisionist elements like Liu Shaoqi, Deng Xiaoping, Peng Chen, [as received] Lo Jui-tsin, [as received], Ho Lung [as received] and others, have been in the leadership, had taken power, made the law, supported the bureaucracy and posed as Marxists.

Likewise, it is becoming clear that there must have been two lines in the Communist Party of China: the line of Mao and that of these revisionists, the bourgeois, reactionary, anti-Marxist line. Mao and the comrades who supported his line must have been in the minority and unable to act to overcome this dangerous situation. This could and must be the situation in general outline, but we cannot define it exactly right without knowing the facts and the dates, when and how such a thing occurred, in what circumstances and how it was developed, who contributed to this situation, how great are the mistakes of one or the other, and to what extent the one

or the other contributed in order to overcome this situation, or on the contrary, to strengthen it.

It is also a fact that the majority of these main bad elements had worked systematically to place their men in key positions, to educate and inspire them, and to have everything under control through them, with the exception, apparently, of the army.

Apparently, the revisionists had calculated on getting a firm grip on the state power and the party from within quietly, without any fuss, avoiding either political or economic attacks and continuing to cover themselves, for appearance's sake, under the name of Mao.

It would be interesting, underlines Comrade Enver Hoxha, if an analysis were to be made of the diabolical ways employed by them to place Mao in the minority, of the use of Mao's mistakes or concessions in line (which there certainly must be) in order to strengthen their reactionary positions.

It would also be interesting to know how Mao worked and gave leadership encircled by all these enemies and what his concessions and mistakes in line are. The main thing we want to know is Mao's stand towards these enemies, his "placating" tactic in order to outflank and overcome these revisionists, is it a temporary stand, or is it his line?

The fact is that at that time Mao found himself in the minority, and the enemy had eroded the party internally, which it seemed had decayed. For this reason he relied on the army in this situation and must have considered that the army would play the decisive role in this revolution. Therefore, the army had to be in his hands, and by this means he had to bring the enemies of socialism and the party to their senses,

It is quite clear that the military fist under the direction of Mao and Lin Biao, was a reality which stood and stands ready behind the cultural revolution.

Dealing with the source of principled deformations in the organs of state power in China, in the note of Friday, March 3, 1967 entitled:

The Distortions of Principle in the Organs of State Power Have Resulted From the Mistakes in Line

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes among others:

The People's Councils, as basic organs of state power in the socialist countries, have their source in the Leninist experience of the Soviets. In our conditions, this experience was adapted to the government of the country and was embraced by the working people. We do not understand why the Chinese comrades are making a series of "experiments" in this direction to find "new forms?"

If the Chinese comrades have allowed the power of their People's Councils to fall for a long time under the leadership of revisionist elements, in this way causing distortions in principle, these must be corrected, because it is not the forms or the principles that are at fault, but the deviations and mistakes in line.

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha criticized the unprincipled attitudes adopted in China towards the revisionists, in the note of Friday, April 7, 1967 entitled:

In China They Are Moving Towards the 'Unification' of the Party With the State

He writes:

The revolution was raised to overthrow the counter-revolution established over seventeen years. This is the good aspect. But has the counter-revolution been overthrown completely in China? This is not clear, there must still be places where it has not been overthrown, where it is tolerated, because the revolution is still not able to defeat the counter-revolution everywhere.

It seems that the bourgeois-capitalist line in China has not been a superficial phenomenon but very deepgoing. The Chinese revisionists had the party, the state, the economy firmly in their grip.

For the moment only the political exposure of the revisionists and their leaders like Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping, is continuing, and the "original" and ludicrous thing about it is that the official Chinese press is talking about all those political and ideological crimes of Liu Shaoqi, but never mentions his name. This is truly astonishing. This is reminiscent of those moments when they did not want to mention Khrushchev by name.

But here another question arises: Where was Mao, where were all the other "revolutionary" comrades, when Liu Shaoqi expressed such political and ideological opinions (these are now being printed in the papers), which not one normal capitalist, nor even Hitler and Mussolini in their most ferocious period, expressed, for fear that they would be exposed? Whereas Liu Shaoqi who has expressed all these ideas, still remains, even if only formally, vice-chairman of the party and president of the republic.

Another important question, as we understand (or better say, as we do not understand) is that "the party does not exist," but individual communists exist. The communist youth does not exist, but many organizations of the "Red Guard" exist, party committees and state organs do not exist, but "revolutionary committees," appointed "by the masses" according to the principle of the "three-in-one combination," exist. This is the "new form" which emerged from the cultural revolution.

As we understand it, they are moving towards the "unification of the party with the state." This is the "experience of the cultural revolution." Some say: "This is a trial, some have made it a fait accompli, others are maintaining the structure of the party. The devil alone knows.

I think that this question will take a long time to be cleared up and with half-pie measures, tatonnements (groping in the dark) (French in the original), trial and error, while rejecting the Marxist-Leninist experience gained, it will not be cleared up well, because already opportunist symptoms, softening and fear of the revolutionary masses are apparent.

The hostile work of the Chinese revisionists, and the lack of truly radical measures for their definite suppression have brought and are bringing great harm to the international communist movement.

The anarchic opposition, too, of the masses to the party had not and cannot have anything in common with a true revolutionary movement, as it was acted during the so-called cultural revolution in China, something which is subject to a stern criticism on the part of Comrade Enver Hoxha.

In the note Friday, April 28, 1967 entitled:

Reflections on the Cultural Revolution. Anarchy Cannot Be Combated With Anarchy

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes among others:

The official Chinese press and first of all the newspaper RENMIN RIBAO, which is the organ of the Central Committee, guards against expressing its real opinion and the analysis of events. Therefore, in place of these things, it writes mostly to prove that "Mao's ideas have always been and are correct," that "Mao has understood everything correctly, he foresees everything correctly, and everyone should follow the teachings of Mao," which are given through quotations and have been filling the newspapers and covering the walls, peoples' bodies and things for the last year. It seems that the Chinese comrades explain events as if they are the outcome of the ideas of Mao, and thus every article, every note, is directed to convincing people that Mao is a "genius," instead of explaining concretely what is occurring in reality. This is a serious shortcoming in the presentation of things.

It seems to me, however, that this is not accidental. It represents a chaotic situation and a method of work and struggle unsuitable for putting things in order. I think, and perhaps I am wrong, that the cultural revolution was begun without clear perspectives, the course on which it was to proceed was not defined, and neither the expected nor the unexpected things were foreseen. I think that the general staff of the revolution did not exist. They went into the revolution without the party.

What became of the party? Where is the party? Who led the party? According to information, the party was not in the hands of Mao, others were manoeuvring it. Hence, the party, as a Marxist-Leninist party, did not come out in revolution and did not lead the revolution.

The "Red Guard" rose in revolution, but this was not the party, nor the communist youth organization, nor the trade-union organization, nor the working class. This is a great minus from the angle of principle and organization.

Hence, the main question, Comrade Enver Hoxha, writes further on, was the question of state power. To struggle to seize power implies that someone is holding this power and is not relinquishing it, therefore you must rise in revolution. Thus, as it turns out, they rose in the revolution to take power without the party at the head, or to put it better, the party had power, but the party was not on the right road.

Was the party on the right road or not? If not, then it should be clearly stated why, what the mistakes consisted of, who had made these mistakes, and how they had to be corrected. If the party was on the right road, why did it not lead the revolution in fact? If the revisionists are the minority, then why does the party not eliminate them immediately, and especially now that the revolution is being carried out?

I think that the revolution is the most serious thing that can be undertaken, and it does not permit spontaneity, lack of iron discipline, vacillations on principles, anarchy, or confusion, all these things, which should not be allowed, we find in the Chinese Cultural Revolution. Not only have these things not come to an end, but, the way they are going, they will continue for a long time to the detriment of the revolution and socialism in China.

If it does not strike down the leaders of the betrayal, or at least mention them, by name, the revolution is not revolution. Without cutting off the heads of a few traitors that deserve it, it is not revolution. If you act as the Chinese comrades are acting, then say no more about the dictatorship of the proletariat, don't speak about the class struggle, because in this case these are words and nothing but words.

But let us take the question of the unmasking. Is this being done correctly, and who is leading it? It is a fact that the party is not doing this, it is not working as an organized force within certain limits, it is paralysed, if not destroyed. The "Red Guard" is carrying out this exposure through dazibaos. The "Red Guard" and all "those who are making the revolution" say whatever they want, abuse and discredit whoever they want. In a word, it is not the party as a party which is leading all these activities, but Mao is leading them with a series of comrades whom it is difficult to control all over that great China, where, effectively, there is no party and where the enemy has been working intensively for tens of years. The existing anarchy cannot be combated with anarchy.

The C. P. of China Has Made Serious Mistakes

I think that the great mistake of Mao and the other comrades lies in the fact that they are not handling the "question of the party," the question of the line and the cadres of the party correctly. In my opinion, the question should be presented in this way: Has the party made mistakes during seventeen years or has it not?

Naturally, the Communist Party of China has made serious mistakes. Somebody led it on to a wrong road, and the party was not able to see where they were leading it. Hence, together with a few individuals, many others have made mistakes, too. It is essential that the party analyse its correct line and correct it first of all. If the party does not see its mistake, the mistake cannot be corrected. Questions are not put forward in this way in China, and the party is treated in an off-hand manner.

The problem arises: Who is right and who is wrong? "Have Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping made mistakes," and Mao not? Of course, some people there have been wrong, and these are the gang of Liu Shaoqi. However, together with Liu and Deng Xiaoping, the whole party has gone wrong, hence even Mao himself, who has allowed the party to go wrong.

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

These things can hardly be put in order with an article about "the treatment of cadres," or "down with anarchy," because these voices do not catch the ear of the party as a party, as an organized detachment of the class. The party is in confusion, they are keeping it in confusion, and justify this by saying, "The revolution is being carried out." Without the party there is no genuine revolution, without the party the revolution will be lame, will run into serious, unexpected difficulties.

Why don't they begin with the strengthening of the party at the base, if it is difficult to achieve this at the centre? Why are they trying to put things in order from above only? It is clear that the comrades are not relying on the party as an organized or a re-organized party after the shake-up. They are only appointing committees, like that of Beijing (which changed three times, and despite this they hailed it as an event of major international significance).

As I see it the Chinese comrades have a pronounced dose of liberalism and opportunism in their activities. Naturally, this is very harmful. These tendencies cannot be either new or accidental. The fact that for seventeen years two lines have been observed in their party and have co-existed without a great deal of friction between them (recently, it has been alleged that there was friction, although they seem to have adjusted to each other, that they appear to be a single whole), proves the social-democratic opportunism in their line,

The Communist Party of China Has Tolerated Two Lines in Its Ranks

The fact is that the Communist Party of China has gone on for tens of years on end tolerating two lines in its ranks. If it proceeds from the principle that two active lines are necessary in the party, then the party cannot be a Marxist-Leninist party. Even within the party a class struggle must be waged, indeed a stern struggle, to totally liquidate the anti-party, anti-Marxist faction as quickly as possible. We have not seen such a struggle in the Communist Party of China, even when some leaders (who have not been alone) have been condemned as factionists. On the contrary, they have remained not only in the party, but even in the main leadership.

Even now, in the face of this grave situation, with the revolution being waged to seize power from the hands of the revisionists, we see that same sort of dilettantism, soft-heartedness, slowness to act and liberalism towards anti-party elements opposed to the working class. We see that the iron discipline, which ought to exist in the party and in the revolution, is lacking, we do not see its democratic centralism as clear as it should be, especially in revolutionary times, we do not see the true authority of a leader, which is essential, or even the authority of a whole collective leadership in the centre and in the provinces, which is indispensable at any time, and especially at the time when the revolution is being waged.

It Is a Mistake of Catastrophic Proportions To Leave the Party in the Dark

It is a mistake of catastrophic proportions to leave the party in the dark and to oppose the masses to it, to put the leadership of the party, the true collective leadership, under the uncontrolled, undirected fire of the broad masses, or the "Red Guards," who are inspired in a spontaneous and irregular manner. Such laxity cannot be justified with the slogan of the "policy of the masses." The party, organized on correct organizational principles, with a clear political and ideological line, with Marxist-Leninist centralism and iron discipline, must guide the policy of the masses.

Apart from a series of non-Marxist stands, such as the raising of the cult of Mao to the national and international level, the Chinese propaganda is acting in the same way with the proletarian cultural revolution, calling it "as great as, if not greater than, the work of Marx and the October Revolution," etc. This is baseless and vain boasting. According to the Chinese propaganda, all of us have to go through this phase of theirs, because their cultural revolution is universal. This is not so, and cannot be so. If a Marxist-Leninist party, which has taken power and is building socialism falls into such a deep sleep that the new revisionist bourgeoisie and the suppressed capitalist classes have almost recaptured power, as is the case in China at present, then power must be retaken, the revolution must be carried out again and it can be called proletarian only if the objectives which it sets and attains and the way it is carried out are consistently on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

A Marxist-Leninist party like ours, which is building socialism correctly, which wages the class struggle effectively and not just with words, which is deepening the proletarian revolution with success, underlines Comrade Enver Hoxha, cannot proceed on the road the Chinese advocate. The road of our party is revolutionary, consistent and Marxist-Leninist.

[18 Jul 79]

[Text] Tirana July 18 (ATA)--In the first volume of "Reflections on China" Comrade Enver Hoxha analyses and criticizes the distortions made in the cadres policy in China. In the note of Wednesday, May 3, 1967 entitled:

Can This Be Called a Cadre Policy?

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: It is difficult to understand what criteria are being applied in China on the question of cadres, which is so very important. When serious problems arose, like those of the anti-party groups of Kao Gang, Peng Teh-huai or Wang Ming, the impression was given, of course a false impression, that these deviators were isolated individuals, without a base in the party, and it was considered that their activity was without consequences. This was a false situation, and they made every effort to present such a situation as genuine, indeed they went so far that the party and world communist opinion did not learn why Kao Gang committed suicide, why Peng Teh-huai was again a member of the Presidium, and Wang Ming a member of the Central Committee, to whom a fat salary was paid even while he was a political exile in Moscow. Hence a liberal bourgeois opportunist stand was maintained towards these anti-party enemy elements. Khrushchev lauded this stand of theirs, and in a talk with us, Mikoyan described it as a "fine stand of the Chinese comrades," that "had nothing in common with Stalin's policy towards cadres."

Perhaps the Chinese comrades will use the excuse that allegedly they could not do otherwise, that allegedly there were two lines, that allegedly Comrade Mao was in the minority, and it was the group of Liu that made the cadres policy. These arguments can hardly be accepted, especially when they have to do with top cadres who are anti-party, whose hostile work has been exposed and who have been denounced by Mao himself.

However, for the moment let us accept the above reason, but why are they acting in the same way now with Liu, Deng, Tao Chu, etc.? Complete silence is being maintained about them. For one year their names have not been mentioned officially, while the walls of China have been covered with dazibaos which leave nothing unsaid about them. And not only about them, but also about all the cadres, including Chu Teh, Chin Yi, Ho Lung, and hundreds of others, whom the dazibaos are publicly tearing to shreds.

Why is this? I think, because among the Chinese comrades the idea exists: "First we must unmask them before the masses, and then officially," or they should exert pressure on them to admit their mistakes, allegedly to bring them into line, to rehabilitate them, and in the end to say: "We

did not speak officially, the masses spoke, the masses made criticism," etc. Thus, sooner or later, we are back where we were--Liu remains president, remains in the Central Committee, remains in the Presidium as Wang Ming, Peng Teh-huai and others did earlier.

Can this be called a cadres policy? Can this be called class struggle? Is this tempering the party?

What is occurring with Chu Teh? The dazibaos have left nothing unsaid against him. Kang Sheng himself spoke of him as a "corrupt, anti-Maoist militarist," while at the May Day celebrations in Peking he appeared in public in a demonstrative way together with Mao, fourth in line after him. What are we to understand from this? He has allegedly acknowledged his mistakes and hung on to his position.

Tomorrow this may occur with Liu and Deng, too. Why not? "Let them remain in the posts they have and correct their mistakes," as they told us about Wang Ming and Peng Teh-huai.

Such actions are not correct at all, they will cost China and its communist party dearly. On this line, Liu and his group will undoubtedly "pull in their heads," as they have done at other times, and will raise them again, as they have done at other times, too. But when they raise them again, Mao will no longer be there to save the situation.

The Crisis in the Communist Party of China Existed Before Liberation

In the note of Tuesday, July 4, 1967 Comrade Enver Hoxha writes among others: The cultural revolution which is going on in China makes clear to us many problems which we did not know of, or on which we were not completely clear. The main thing it makes clear to us is that in the ranks of the leadership of the Communist Party of China, and naturally in the party itself, there were two opposing lines: the line of Mao Zedong and the line of Liu Shaoqi.

We can reach the approximate conclusion that the crisis in the party existed before liberation, continued after liberation, and then flared up in 1959 when the "great leap forward" began and two opposing lines became obvious. As it now appears, about 1962 Mao began his offensive, while in 1965 and 1966 the open struggle began, which was waged with the cultural revolution, the "Red Guard," etc. In 1967 (January 21) RENMIN RIBAO writes: "The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution has been a struggle for power right from the start..."

Disgraceful and Anti-Marxist Stand

In the light of a thorough-going Marxist-Leninist analysis, Comrade Enver Hoxha resolutely refutes the brutal attempts of the Chinese leadership to impose Mao Zedong as the "greatest Marxist in the whole history of communism" and the "experience" of the so-called proletarian cultural revolution on all the Marxist-Leninist parties and socialist countries. In the note of Friday, July 14, 1967 he writes:

Besides other things, a certain lack of modesty can also be seen on the part of the Chinese, who in a forced manner, sometimes with infantile methods and forms, want to assume the role of the leadership of the international communist movement, instead of leaving it to the others to make such an evaluation. They present matters in a distorted way: "He who is with the ideas of Mao Zedong is a Marxist-Leninist; he who allows himself to ask certain natural, fair questions is suspect and can even be considered an anti-Marxist."

These stands have their source in the exaggerated "cult of the individual" that some dazibaos, which we, of course, believe are uncontrolled (but for the time being these are the official reference materials we have), put Mao even before Marx, Lenin and Stalin. These posters say: "Mao is the culmination of Marxism." Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha continues: What has Mao been doing during these eighteen years and why has he allowed the party to be weakened? Why has he left it in the hands of revisionists, who have eroded it from within? During this whole "dark" period, has Comrade Mao been isolated, has he been in the minority, or has he too, been swimming in opportunist waters and as such permitted two lines in the Communist Party of China?

This whole situation, all this development, is being kept in the dark, being hidden. The newspapers and dazibaos carry only quotations from the works of Mao prior to 1942. But why only before this date and not after it, precisely at the time when these things occurred? And not to mention the mistakes which are occurring now, during the cultural revolution.

Despite all these wrong stands, the Chinese comrades want to impose Mao by force as the "greatest Marxist in the whole history of communism," want the whole communist movement of the world to adopt and apply their experience en bloc, to apply their cultural revolution. The way the Chinese propaganda is presenting the problem is neither realistic, correct, nor acceptable.

The Chinese comrades think that aid for the international communist movement and the world revolution consists of recommending that they carry out the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution as China did. According to them, from now on, it is not necessary to be inspired by the Great October Socialist Revolution (perhaps by the Paris commune, yes), but by the cultural revolution, because, just as Marxism-Leninism has been replaced with "Mao Zedong Thought," so the cultural revolution contains the October Socialist Revolution. The Chinese newspapers are writing these things. This is a disgraceful anti-Marxist stand. They go so far in their mistakes and claims, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, that they say: "It is Mao who has created the people's wars; he is the father of people's wars." In other words, the peoples who have fought for freedom against oppression and so on for centuries have done nothing. Consequently, the Bolshevik party and the party of labour of Albania, which have waged people's war, have done nothing. For these to be people's wars, they must bear the brand of Mao and his ideas.

Thus, the great classics are written off and the theory about the revolution and people's wars is written off. This behaviour is not only unacceptable, but also intolerable.

The Chinese comrades have arrived at the opinion that the little red book, "Quotations From Mao Zedong" is the "culmination of Marxist-Leninist science and philosophy, the key to revolutions and victories." And they say: "Take it, read it, learn it by heart, and come out in the streets and make revolution." We have to say that these claims are infantile. We think that in order to advise other parties correctly you must be very well acquainted with the political situation in the countries where they operate and nevertheless you must still be very prudent. The matter becomes even more dangerous in the case when you have not developed the policy of the front or alliances correctly in your own country and want to serve them up to others as a model.

This Is Not Marxist, This Is Trotskyism, This Is Wrong

In the note of Tuesday, August 15, 1967 Comrade Enver Hoxha once more condemns the exaggeration of the cult of Mao. He points out:

According to the facts presented, Liu Shaoqi, Deng Xiaoping and company have truly betrayed Marxism-Leninism. Therefore they should be struck lethal blows. This should have been done long ago. The questions always arise: Why was this hostile work which, according to the documents presented, had been detected long ago by Mao Zedong, allowed to develop? Why was it allowed to become so threatening that "it endangered the existence of socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat in China?" For the present, these questions are not being answered.

However, such a situation has caused colossal damage to China and the Communist Party of China, millions of cadres have been misled, thinking that "the line that was followed by the enemy was the correct line of Mao." In brief, antisocialism, anti-Marxism has been allowed to conceal itself under the name of Mao. On the one hand, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, Mao was bombarded with praise, and on the other hand, intensive enemy work was carried out. This means to have completely lost one's revolutionary vigilance, or to content oneself with repeating a few correct principles over and over again, and allow the enemies to manipulate them as they please and to do the opposite, or to partly reconcile oneself to this unhealthy situation, or be completely in the minority, because the enemy has managed to deceive the majority.

The Chinese press is bombarding Mao with paeans of praise, making a real god of him, liquidating Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, as if there were nothing wrong with this and reaches the scandalous point of saying, "Those who do not follow the road of Mao and the cultural revolution, whether revolutionary Marxists of the world, or countries where the dictatorship of the proletariat is in power, are deviators." This is not Marxist, this is Trotskyism. This is wrong.

As far as we are concerned, our only correct unerring course is, and will remain, Marxism-Leninism.

Defeats and Victories of the Chinese Revisionists

In the note of Monday, January 22, 1968, speaking about the grave mistakes in the line of the C.P. of China, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: It is becoming clearer every day that the Chinese modern revisionists, headed by Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping, "had vested themselves with power and taken the capitalist road," as the Chinese comrades put it. This means that this hostile, reactionary, rightist faction, which existed for tens of years at the head of the Communist Party of China, worked and organized the great plot to transform China into a capitalist country, the dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and the Communist Party of China into a bourgeois revisionist party. In the line of the Communist Party of China, apart from other publicly known concessions, underlines Comrade Enver Hoxha, their 8th congress, held in 1956, marks a date and a further stage in the consolidation of the revisionist positions.

There organization of the party, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, is the decisive issue and the victory or defeat of China depend on this. The question is: On what foundations will the party be built? Will the basic Marxist-Leninist principles on the building of a truly Marxist-Leninist party be kept in mind, as they should? If so, first of all, there must be no forgetting or distorting of the principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the party.

A Chinese Bolshevik party, rebuilt on the basis of Marxist-Leninist criteria, will be the salvation of China and the guarantee that it will proceed on the Marxist-Leninist socialist road in the future. But if the enemy is underestimated, as has occurred up to now, then China is lost. You can talk as much as you like about the class struggle, but this struggle must be waged sternly, correctly, from the positions of the working class and Marxism-Leninism.

What we call the cult of Mao, which is truly an inflated cult, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, is assuming ever more unprecedented proportions. But why does Mao permit the inflation of this cult? Perhaps the critical moments which China went through, the fact the Communist Party of China was not only in confusion, but also in the hands of revisionists, impelled Mao to permit the inflation of his name and authority in order to mobilize the sound revolutionary energies of the masses so that he could hurl them into revolution. Otherwise China would have been lost. I do not know to what extent this great boosting of the cult of Mao can be justified, but in any case it seems to me that this inflated cult of his has nothing Marxist about it.

Chen Po-ta Is Denounced as a Traitor

Is the title of the note of Wednesday, February 17, 1971. Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: The comrades of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China have informed us officially that "Chen Po-ta has been declared a traitor."

From the start of the cultural revolution down to this day, Chen Po-ta was recognized officially as one of the main active leaders after Mao, indeed ahead of Kang Sheng, let alone ahead of Zhou Enlai, who did not take part at all in this leading committee. Thus, suddenly, after all this glorification and these major duties, he is declared a traitor.

Is Chen Po-ta an enemy and a traitor? This, naturally, is a question which we cannot determine. The Communist Party of China has the competence to judge this on the basis of facts and data, and their correct objective interpretation on the Marxist-Leninist dialectical road. However on the basis of what I said above, great doubts arise in our minds.

I think that under the cover of Mao Zedong Thought, powerful groups which sometimes conform, sometimes come out separately, sometimes attack and sometimes are attacked, are clashing fiercely, a struggle is being waged for power, for the consolidation of positions, over who will praise the name of Mao and proclaim his ideas more extravagantly, while on the other hand struggling to do their own work with great mastery, to place their own men, to occupy the key positions, to become absolutely "necessary," "untouchable," and "beyond criticism."

[19 Jul 79]

[Text] Tirana, July 19 (ATA)--Making an analysis of facts and events in China in continuation of his notes Comrade Enver Hoxha draws the firm conclusion that the "cultural revolution" was neither a revolution, nor great, nor cultural, and in particular, not in the least proletarian, but an unprincipled strife between opposite bourgeois and petty-bourgeois factions, trends and lines in the fold of the leadership of the C.P. of China and the Chinese state, which were fighting with one another, even with guns, in order to seize the power. In the note of Monday, January 2, 1972, entitled:

What Is Going on With the Lin Biao Group?

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes among others: The Chinese comrades are still not telling us anything in connection with the question of Lin Biao and the other army men who have disappeared from the scene since September 1971.

When the cultural revolution was coming to an end, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes, Chen Po-ta turned out to be a "traitor, enemy, spy, assassin." Then, there emerged the question of Lin Biao, "the deputy of Mao Zedong and his loyal comrade-in-arms," appointed and consecrated in the party

constitution approved by the 9th Congress of the Communist Party of China. A congress which was held 12-13 years after the 8th congress, and after all those events which had shaken China.

One may well be astonished and ask: How do these things occur and how are they permitted? Does the party act and judge in such important questions, or are rival groups acting there? The Marxist-Leninist logic of our party cannot consider all these actions in order and correctly.

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: In a page of my diary about China, at the time of the cultural revolution, at the time of the crisis China was going through, when we were trying to draw conclusions for ourselves in order to maintain correct stands, because at that time, too, like now, the Chinese comrades did not tell us anything, I remember I put up the hypothesis of a military coup d'etat in order to dominate in the party. (See pp 277-281 in the first volume). I condemned such an action, and it is to be condemned at any time. The army must be a weapon of the dictatorship in the hands of the party, and the party must not become a tool commanded by the army, anything can happen in a country where the party is not in charge, when it is not strong, monolithic and Marxist-Leninist in principle and in action. We can expect anything from the group of Lin Biao, just as we can expect anything from that of Zhou Enlai. The two extremes come together.

Again in my earlier writings, drawing conclusions from the Chinese press, because the Chinese comrades never informed us about these matters, I described it as a major mistake of principle for "the army men to take over the leadership of the party" or for "the army men to dominate." This was done allegedly on the pretext that the leaderships of the party, with the exception of those of the peasant communes, were under the influence of the group of Liu Shaoqi, that is, they were "men of this group." This was not said openly in the press, but it was confirmed in practice there. It came out (because later its reorganization began anew), that the party "was broken up" and "suspended" its activity during the cultural revolution. The same thing occurred with all the organizations of the masses, too. Only the countryside and the army escaped this "organized disorder." Thus, it turned out that the army led, or that the army men were the main ones who were leading while describing such a thing as incorrect, we said that at the height of the "disorder," this "might have been necessary" temporarily and afterwards everything must be brought within the norms. [sentence as received] But nothing was done. This situation continued even when the "calm" began, when the "organization" of the party and revolutionary committees recommended. The army men were everywhere in large numbers, not as a few chosen people, but as "the chosen."

Now, with the condemnation of Lin Biao, for which, of course, we do not know the true reason, which we think must be political questions of strategy, line, they will saddle him with the blame for all these mistakes of principle, will say that Lin Biao alone was to blame for the fact that

the army men took over the running of the party and continued to do so even later. Hence, it will turn out that all these are Lin Biao's men and the clean-up with the broom, which will no doubt be done, will be presented dressed up with "principled slogans," about the "preservation of the norms" of the party, but the reality will be entirely different.

The 'Lin Biao Plot'

Under this title appears the note, dated: Durres, Saturday, July 22, 1972. It reads:

At last, after nearly eleven months, the Chinese comrades, through our ambassador in Beijing as well as the Chinese ambassador in Tirana, have given us some official information about the "ultra-leftists" or the "Lin Biao plot."

After dealing with the background of Lin Biao's plot as it has been explained by the Chinese, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes further on: This can occur if revolutionary vigilance is lost, if the party is not on the rails of Marxism-Leninism, if it is educated in the idealist spirit of the cult of the individual, and not on the basis of materialist dialectics and historical materialism.

The question arises: How was Lin Biao allowed to do all these things? How was this man, who had made mistakes, placed at the head of the party and boosted so much? How was it allowed that Chen Po-ta, the person they told us what he was, should be placed at the head of the cultural revolution? How did it come about that "all those great mistakes," which were made during the cultural revolution, were not prevented in time? They say that they did not understand. But these things were sticking out a mile, even we understood them from away over here, though we did not know many things and had no knowledge of the directives issued, so they should have understood them.

The fact is that the Communist Party of China was not "on its feet." If it was not liquidated, it was paralysed, and the Chinese comrades say that Mao's directives were not implemented. Who was to implement them? The conspirators? It is self-evident that they would not implement them, but on the contrary, would sabotage them. If the Chinese comrades do not take these analyses through to the end, in order to disclose the true causes and find the true Marxist-Leninist cure, nothing will go right in China, and other, even more serious things will occur there. They say that such events have occurred ten times. This means that they have become a tradition, a line there. They can occur, it is a big country, a big party. However, the Chinese comrades have not drawn the real lessons from all these bad things. Groups in the leadership are quarrelling, attacking, being overthrown, one after the other. As soon as one is overthrown, a second one rises, this falls and another rises. Explanations are made in the party, Mao alone remains the banner. All of them fight

under the banner of Mao, but this banner of his is not identified with that of the party, so that this can waver. Idealism may be combated in words, but the cult of Mao is nothing other than idealism. Instead of strengthening the party, making it self-acting, a leading force, it paralyses it, makes it an automation. Decisions are made only when Mao is asked to say the word, but how he will say this word, depends on those who dictate it to him.

Various Groups With Different Tendencies Have Run Things in the Leadership of the C.P. of China

On reading the minutes taken by the comrades of our military delegation in their talk with Zhou Enlai in Beijing, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes in the note dated: Vlora, Sunday, December 17, 1972 that Zhou Enlai, after mentioning the problems of the foreign policy of China, spoke about the internal situation in China:

The other question which Zhou Enlai raised during the talk, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, was about the internal situation in China, the question of the Lin Biao group. He spun this problem out at length, although in general what he said was what their ambassador told us officially.

Zhou Enlai described the activity of Lin Biao as among the most dangerous which China has experienced. "Lin Biao and his associates," he said, "were among the most dangerous conspirators, but they were a small group of nine people." Here we see the first contradiction. Of course, Zhou's version that they were conspirators is accepted, but it is astonishing that these nine or ten people constituted the greatest danger for China, just as the other contradiction that Lin Biao and his group sabotaged everything during the cultural revolution, is astonishing. There is no doubt that, as enemies they were, they damaged and impeded things, but to blame them for every instance of damage, every failure to fulfill plans, every small defect, is making the dose rather strong. It is said that this small but very dangerous group sabotaged industry, agriculture, and its mechanization, sabotaged the weapons of the army, etc.

We put the question: But the others, the good ones, where were they?

According to Zhou Enlai, every mistake in the course of diplomacy, policy, ideology was made by the group of Lin Biao.

We put the question: But the good ones, where were they? Why did they not react?

Lin Biao built up the cult of Mao to a high level and it was he who called Mao "a great Marxist-Leninist," "the great leader," "the great helmsman."

Again we put the question: But the others, the good ones, where were they? Why did they not stop these things?

According to Zhou Enlai, Lin Biao was the man of the Soviets, but again, according to Zhou Enlai, he was afraid of an imminent attack by them against China, to the point that, without the knowledge of the bureau or Mao, he had given orders for the airfields to be filled with steel obstacles to prevent the Soviet aircraft from landing, and for the dykes to be breached and cities inundated to hinder the Soviet paratroops.

Thus, in the minutes of Zhou Enlai's exposition one finds a series of events connected and isolated, all to prove that the Lin Biao group was a dangerous group of traitors, saboteurs, etc. Zhou Enlai went so far as to say, "Lin Biao pretended to be sick but he was a malingerer."

Many astonishing things about a person who "had achieved a very high position."

Why should we not accept all these things which they are dishing up to us now about Lin Biao, about a man who was quite unknown to us? He never appeared on the scene, had no activity at all, and as to what he was or was not, we know nothing, except that Mao, Zhou and the others and the whole party supported him. Yesterday all of them said the most marvelous things about him, while today they ascribe every evil to him.

We are quite unable to determine how far these enemies had gone in their activity, say the Chinese. But according to Zhou, their activity had gone so far as the organization of plots (not just once) to kill Mao.

We have numerous queries to raise about this internal question of China, because, in this treatment of problems, as Zhou Enlai gave it, and this is also the official version presented to their whole party, there are many major contradictions.

First, in this presentation of problems, the hostile work of Liu Shaoqi and his big group, which had taken everything in its hands, had eliminated Mao and had reduced the party to such a state that the cultural revolution had to be launched to clean up this situation, is completely forgotten. Mao himself has several times said to our comrades: "It is not yet known who will win, we or they."

As far as we know, the Chinese comrades have not made a thorough Marxist-Leninist analysis of the hostile activity of the Liu Shaoqi group to disclose the roots and sources of this activity. Articles have been written and propaganda made against it, but this has remained only propaganda. The facts show that during the cultural revolution, another more dangerous enemy group emerged in the leadership and it was at the head of the cultural revolution. This group, which was at the head, and which had as its tasks to purge the pro-Soviet enemies, Liu and his group, turns out to be pro-Soviet itself.

It was necessary to carry out the cultural revolution, but were the directives which guided it clear? Yes and no. It seems as if the directives emerged from an amazing spontaneity, and this caused distortions to the right and the left. The Lin Biao group was "ultra-leftist."

A great deal has been said and written about the cultural revolution, but no profound analysis of it has been made by the Chinese comrades. Was the cultural revolution beneficial or harmful to China? The Chinese say that it was beneficial, but how then is it explained that Lin Biao and his nine collaborators sabotaged everything?

Such analyses are not very serious. Lin Biao and company carried out sabotage, but what has become of all the hostile activity of Liu Shaoqi? And all those others whom this group left behind in the party and the state, did they not continue their sabotage? These things are underestimated. The great vacillations of the working class, indeed even the sabotage and the fights with the people of the cultural revolution, have been forgotten, it has been forgotten that the party ceased any activity and was so badly smashed that it still has not been organized. And what about the organizations of the masses, which were completely liquidated? Why? Because "they were not in order." Has this great disorder not caused damage, held things up, resulted in sabotage? These things must be analysed, but they are not analysed merely by saying that Lin Biao has done all these evil things.

It has been said that Zhou Enlai continues to say: "The army was and is the backbone." Astonishing. At the head of the army was Lin Biao, and "he could not use the army for his own purposes," while he was able to sabotage everything when Mao and Zhou were at the head. This is incomprehensible, or becomes comprehensible only by thinking that the Communist Party of China was not on the right road, did not think and act on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, and on the basis of the Leninist norms of truly revolutionary party.

In fact, various groups with different tendencies have run things in the leadership of the Communist Party of China. Mao was a philosopher, but it seems he did not link his philosophy much with practice, was liberal, and in this direction allowed others to organize, to lead and to distort. He placed little importance on the collective method of leadership, and allowed the groups to act as though there were nothing wrong with this. And the groups attacked one another. Mao was not an outsider and reacted to the attacks of these groups, but it was the groups that operated under the banner of Mao, and with this banner tried to eliminate Mao himself. Liu Shaoqi and company acted in this way, and so did Lin Biao and company.

But Zhou Enlai, what did he do? In all circumstances, he had always shown himself very resilient, very pragmatic, a person who goes along with everybody, with the strongest, so long as they are in power, and against them when they are overthrown. Zhou always linked any stand of his, whether for or against, with "Mao Zedong Thought." Hence, at any time, whether good or bad for him, at the beginning or end of any event, he waved the "banner of Mao."

This showed that Zhou Enlai, following Mao Zedong Thought like all the rest, acted on the line of Liu Shaoqi and applied it in policy, in ideology and especially in the economy. Likewise with the group of Lin Biao, it maintained these same stands.

When these two groups broke their necks, Zhou Enlai's neck was still whole. He is more a diplomat than a Marxist and manoeuvres in any circumstances.

Zhou Enlai was necessary to all, from Mao to Lin Biao, because he is a capable person, a great organizer, an outstanding economist, a talented diplomat, and at the same time, a perfect opportunist. In all these directions he is one of the most outstanding figures of China after Mao, indeed, I may say, even more qualified than Mao Zedong.

[20 Jul 79]

[Text] Tirana, July 20 (ATA)--In the first volume of his book "Reflections on China," Comrade Enver Hoxha devotes a special attention to the problems of the relations among the sister parties and the unity of the Marxist-Leninist movement. In this field, he resolutely opposes the chauvinist stands of the Chinese leadership to force the sister parties to submit to "its conductor's baton."

The Chinese Have Begun a Campaign of Approaches to the Revisionists of Europe Who Are in Power

In the note of Tuesday, October 15, 1964, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

The Chinese comrades ... have begun a campaign of approaches to the revisionists of Europe who are in power (with the exception of the Soviets). From the negative position they wanted to adopt on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of China's national day, of not inviting not only the revisionists but also us, now they are going to the revisionists' celebrations, speaking blandly, with enthusiasm and ardour, about the "friendship of the peoples," etc. They tell us: "We must work well among them, because we shall benefit from the contradiction which they have with Khrushchev." However, such is the Chinese enthusiasm that "it may wipe out the contradictions" which the Chinese themselves have with these revisionists, in favour of the latter, or of an unprincipled compromise. This whole business indicates something unhealthy, non-Marxist.

If the Chinese have a "plan for an offensive" in Europe, a "new and original tactic" to benefit from the inter-revisionist contradictions and "to fight Khrushchev," they should have put it forward and discussed it together with us and the others. This they did not do and have no intention of doing. They are acting on their own, and all they are saying is only words.

In practice the Chinese comrades put the matter in this way: "We are action, you may follow us or not, as you see fit, we shall not get into

polemics with you, let us leave history to judge those things on which we are not in agreement." This is not correct, this is not Marxist. History is written every day.

Every action, good or bad, of our parties is recorded, linked with former and subsequent actions, and when the actions are not well-considered, they have bad consequences.

Such an Anti-Marxist Course Cannot Continue for Long

In the note of Thursday, November 5, 1964, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes about the new course adopted by the Chinese during that time approach the revisionists. [sentence as received]

In following this revisionist course what will the Chinese comrades advise the Australian, Belgian, Indian, French and other comrades? "Stop the polemic and unite. Find a common language with the revisionists, with Sharky, with Burnel, with Dange, etc. Form a fraternal unity, because this is what our interests require, this is what Mao has thought and decided in Beijing" (and what Mao has decided is as if it has been decided not by Marx but by super-Marx). This is what Zhou Enlai told us, therefore why should he not say it to them?

We have to deal with the Soviet revisionists, while our comrades abroad have to deal not only with the Soviet revisionists, but also with the internal revisionists like Sharky, Dange, Burnel, etc. Or are the Chinese going to say to these comrades: "Continue to struggle against your revisionists?" But this is not logical, this is in flagrant opposition to the course which they are pursuing. They will say to the Chinese: "How can we continue to struggle against Burnel and cease the struggle against the father that produced, raised, and fed Burnel? How can we accept the thesis of the modern revisionists that we must fight 'the madmen' and not expose the chief of American imperialism?" A "great initiative" the Chinese comrades are holding, a "revolutionary initiative." And all they have in their hands is the stench, the filthy stench of their course.

Comrade Enver Hoxha continues:

Such an anti-Marxist course cannot continue for long, it won't be long before it is exposed, because this course, this line, is simply a capitulation on bended knees to the modern revisionists. Marxism-Leninism can never be brought to submission, it will triumph, but the damage which the Chinese are causing is colossal, hence the struggle of the Marxists becomes more difficult, more complicated, but never hopeless and despairing. Genuine Marxist-Leninists never lose sight of the perspective and never despair.

Sternly exposing and attacking the anti-Marxist, chauvinist and disruptive stands of the leadership of the C.P. of China, in his book "Reflections on China" Comrade Enver Hoxha resolutely expresses the unreserved support of the party of labour of Albania for the new Marxist-Leninist parties and forces. In the note of Monday, December 27, 1965, entitled:

We Shall Support the Marxist-Leninist Parties

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

The Chinese comrades do not want the revisionists of the "socialist" countries of Europe to accuse them of interfering in their own internal affairs. Such a stand on the part of China does not prevent the modern revisionists from accusing the Chinese of interfering in their affairs and describing the Marxist-Leninists of their countries as "sold out to the Chinese," and will not prevent them from doing so in the future, either. Likewise, this has not prevented the modern revisionists from interfering illegally and plotting against our parties and countries.

We do not interfere in the internal affairs of any state, but when political and ideological aid is sought from us by the Marxist-Leninist comrades, we, on our part, with great prudence, have given this aid and will continue to do so.

In every instance, the just struggle of the Marxist-Leninist against the revisionists of their own countries rejoices us immensely, and we are not in the least afraid to express our internationalist solidarity with them just because the revisionists will accuse us of "interference." We cannot take an icy stand towards the revolutionary actions of the Marxist-Leninist comrades.

We believe, and have always believed, that the arousing of the masses to revolution in the revisionist countries of Europe is indispensable and urgent. We know also that this work is being done in difficult conditions for our Marxist-Leninist comrades. In these countries there will be fascist terror against them, there is no doubt about that. But the work cannot be done otherwise, there is no other way: either you accept to fight to the finish with the revisionist-fascist cliques, and consequently also accept great sacrifices, or you submit. For revolutionaries no other road is acceptable except the road of struggle.

When you have created the conditions and have struggled to create these conditions, the primary necessity, the main subjective factor and the guarantee of success in the revolution is the formation of the Marxist-Leninist party. No one else apart from the Marxist-Leninists of each particular country can judge whether the conditions for the creation of the Marxist-Leninist party are ripened. Every success and every defeat depends on the correct or incorrect judgment of the internal situations by the Marxist-Leninists, depends on their level of maturity and the degree of their revolutionization, depends on the general line which

they adopt and which must be guided by Marxism-Leninism, depends, also, on the external factors and on the all-round internationalist aid of Marxist-Leninist parties which are in power or those which are not in power but take a firm Marxist-Leninist stand.

In his notes Comrade Enver Hoxha exposes the chauvinist positions of the "big party" of the Chinese leadership on the unity of the Marxist-Leninist movement. At the same time he puts forth the clear stand of the party of labour of Albania on this question. In the note of Monday, October 10, 1966 entitled:

Theses on the Unity of the International Marxist-Leninist Movement

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes among others:

There are two concepts about unity:

- 1) Revisionist "unity (with its variants).
- 2) Marxist-Leninist unity.

We must expose the former and consolidate the latter.

Does complete Marxist-Leninist unity of thought and action exist in the international Marxist-Leninist movement? Yes and no, but not to the extent and in the way it should, because of the growth of this movement and the lack of experience, because of the isolated positions of each Marxist-Leninist party or revolutionary group, and because there is not complete identity of views on many capital common problems, as well as because of the organized and combined struggle which revisionism and imperialism are waging against Marxism-Leninism.

Hence, it is necessary to find the forms and methods to overcome these obstacles. The international communist movement must be guided by Marxism-Leninism interpreted and applied correctly in the present general conditions, and in the specific positions of each Marxist-Leninist party or group, hence, there is a need for an analysis of the current situation, which cannot be done by one party alone, the view of which would be the guiding light for the others. It is necessary also to have consultations among Marxist-Leninist parties or groups from which correct guidelines will emerge for the struggle in the overall and specific conditions.

Capital problems which should have a common definition, which tempers unity and boosts the struggle against modern revisionism:

- 1) The definite break with the revisionists requires a special meeting,
- 2) The birth of revisionism, its causes, etc,
- 3) The question of Stalin,

4) The stand towards the Soviet Union, in the first place, and the other countries where the revisionists are ruling.

5) A more studied stand about more organized political, ideological, technical and material aid to the new Marxist-Leninist parties and groups, the national liberation struggle, about alliances with the progressive anti-imperialist bourgeoisie, and many other problems of this type of great importance to our common struggle.

The Communist Party of China, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha is avoiding general meetings.

A) It proposed the meeting of our nine parties. When we accepted, the CP of China cancelled it.

B) Without holding a meeting, it proposed the creation of an "anti-imperialist front even with the revisionists," and then retracted it.

C) It holds meetings with other parties, one at a time, which it is entitled to do, and after such meetings these parties come out with statements and articles which defend everything which China says and does.

D) Now the entire concern of the Communist Party of China is that the Marxist-Leninist communist movement should accept that the ideas of Mao Zedong lead the world, accept the cult of Mao, the proletarian cultural revolution and the entire line of the Communist Party of China with its good points and its mistakes,

All these things pose many threats to unity.

We must be clear and must not be afraid to look the truth in the eye. Even with us, the Chinese comrades have begun to have silent differences, internally, but there is the danger that these differences will be enlarged. Therefore, we must anticipate events. This we have done and must do. But how are we to explain things openly between our two parties? If these discussions are held on a completely Marxist course, the problems will be solved, otherwise they will get worse.

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha continues:

Just as the opinions of one party cannot be accepted en bloc, neither can those of two parties be accepted en bloc. All must state their opinions. Therefore, the joint meeting and the taking of joint decisions is important. The meeting will be informed of and study the forms of the work and organization and set tasks for each individual party.

Up till now China has avoided this kind of meetings.

In view of all these things: Is it right and necessary for us to present this idea in broad outlines at our congress? I think it is. This is normal, one of the forms of our struggle.

There is no one to oppose the idea in principle, the most they can do is to leave it to melt away from lack of action. But it is they who will be wrong, and not us. In these situations, we cannot hold such meetings without China. China might continue not to want them. Then it bears the responsibility for this. But even though it is not going to find this idea opportune, since we considered it correct from every aspect, we must put it forward. Let the meeting be held when the conditions are ripe, let the struggle decide its organizational forms, etc. We have fulfilled any obligation to China on this issue once, and again on a second occasion. It is China that has postponed the carrying out of this idea.

I think the problems which I put forward above and others like these are very important at present for strengthening the Marxist-Leninist unity of the international communist movement, and cannot be solved apart from joint meetings of the parties. Apparently China does not see it this way and thinks that it is sufficient if we all unanimously approve what is going on in China today, and that our unity is strengthened with this. A further controversy is being added to the others, and judging by the way the Chinese are operating tete-a-tete, we have to envisage that one fine day we might find ourselves isolated from them, although we are on the right road. Therefore, we must foresee all the danger. What I propose are legal, correct forms.

It Is Up to Our Parties To Concretize Our Links With the Marxist-Leninist Movement

Under this title appears the note of Friday, October 28, 1966. Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

Today, at the premises of the Central Committee of the party, I received the delegation of the Communist Party of China, comprised of Kang Sheng, member of the Political Bureau and the secretariat of the CC of the CP of China, Li Xiannian, member of the Political Bureau and the secretariat of the CC of the CP of China, etc., which has come to our country to take part in the proceedings of the 5th Congress of the PLA.

After speaking about the militant friendship between our two countries and parties, about the political-economic situation of the country and the high revolutionary spirit in the party, I dwelt on the stand which we must maintain and on the relations which we should have with the Marxist-Leninist communist parties, with the objective that those things which we shall put forward to the congress, and which I have more or less formulated as theses in this diary (October 10--theses about the unity of the international Marxist-Leninist movement), will not come as a surprise to them.

Our aim was to urge the Chinese comrades somewhat to activize themselves in the support of the new Marxist-Leninist parties. In connection with this question, in general I said these things:

...We think that it is up to us, to both your big party and our party, in the first place, to take the first steps to concretize closer, more effective links with the whole world Marxist-Leninist movement, so that our Marxist-Leninist unity is further tempered and our joint activity against our common enemies is strengthened.

We think, in particular, that the time has come for our Marxist-Leninist parties to develop the most appropriate and fruitful different working contacts. We are not putting forward this important problem for solution now, on the occasion of our congress. No. We put this problem forward to Comrade Zhou Enlai when he visited our country, and are putting it forward to you again.

It seems to us that this problem is important, and it is necessary to discuss and concretize it even in preliminary rudimentary forms, because the modern revisionists and their capitalist patrons have devoted all their demagogic and economic strength, pressure and blackmail to hitting hard at any strengthening of our internationalist Marxist-Leninist unity, to attacking the movement from within, through ideological diversion, and from outside, through isolation.

The modern revisionists are making every effort, every attempt, to penetrate even our recognized, monolithic, revolutionary parties loyal to Marxism-Leninism with their revisionist ideology. One can imagine what they are doing and will do with the new Marxist-Leninist parties and revolutionary groups. We have a major duty to assist our comrades in these parties, which have still not properly consolidated their positions, with all our forces and means.

The Chinese Leaders Maintain Ties With All Sorts of Groups Irrespective of What Tendencies They Have

In the note of Friday, July 14, 1967, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes among others:

Being guided by hasty judgments, incorrect principles, and ill-considered claims, the Chinese comrades could also damage the international communist movement, and especially the new Marxist-Leninist groups and parties which are just being created.

The Chinese comrades have adopted as a permanent principle: "Aid to all Marxist-Leninist groups which are against revisionism and imperialism," but if these movements and groups are not followed in their revolutionary dialectical development and if they are not assessed from a rigorous Marxist-Leninist viewpoint, the aid could sometimes go in wrong directions.

In seeking to establish that "Mao is the world leader sine qua non," etc., at the level of international communism, it could happen that, if some Marxist-Leninist group or party does not put as much emphasis as required on Mao, while deviators in their ranks put this stress strongly on Mao,

the cultural revolution, etc., in order to hide themselves, and benefit from the aid, then it is natural that the latter will be preferred by the Chinese comrades. And even if, in the end, the hostile work of these factionists is understood, the damage has been done.

In the note of Wednesday, March 20, 1968 Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

We see a superficial stand of the Chinese comrades towards the new Marxist-Leninist parties and groups. In fact they have contacts with and give assistance to these parties and groups, even to those groups which remain separate from or against the new parties. They justify these undifferentiated contacts with the position they have adopted from the beginning, saying, "We shall assist all the groups that fight imperialism and revisionism." But the struggle brings about differentiations, and these should be followed up attentively, on bases of principle.

In fact, the Chinese comrades also make some differentiations, but sometimes they are not effectively in a position to follow the real revolutionary activity of those they recognize, who in some cases hide behind the propagation of the cultural revolution, or behind the distribution of Chinese materials and Mao badges.

Some of the new parties are dissatisfied with these stands and have expressed this dissatisfaction, sometimes openly and sometimes in undertones.

In the note dated: Durres, Tuesday, July 27, 1971, Comrade Enver Hoxha stresses:

In practice, the Chinese comrades regard the newly created Marxist-Leninist parties with disdain. They do not support and do not help these parties, but maintain contacts with all sorts of groups, especially those which praise Mao Zedong and the cultural revolution, irrespective of what tendency these groups have.

[21 Jul 79]

[Text] Tirana, July 21 (ATA)--Comrade Enver Hoxha condemns the course of the Chinese leadership for rapprochement with the revisionist parties of various countries. The note dated: Vlora, Friday, July 31, 1970 is entitled:

The Chinese Are Making Love With the Revisionists. Vigilance

The expressions of love, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, continue openly between the Chinese and the revisionists, even in front of our comrades. This, then, is a new line that has been adopted by the Chinese leadership. Our charge d'affaires in China informed us about the conversation which was held in his presence at an ambassadorial reception between the Bulgarian representative in Beijing and the representative of the Ministry of

Foreign Affairs of China. These two spoke to each other as sweetly as lovers and congratulated each other on the re-establishment of "fraternal" diplomatic relations. Up till yesterday the Chinese had the worst relations with the Bulgarians, because the Bulgarian leadership was considered by them the dirtiest and most obedient lackey of the Soviet revisionists. And this is the truth. In this case, the Chinese comrades cannot play on "the deepening of the contradictions between the Soviet and the Bulgarian revisionists," as it pleases them to justify their change. In this case, Bulgaria may serve as a bridgehead and a good example for a more rapid rapprochement with the Soviet revisionists.

Vigilance. If the Chinese leaders go on in this way and do not pull up on this descent they have started on, the course of China will be a catastrophic change.

The C.P. of China Has No Confidence in the New Marxist-Leninist Parties

In the note of Thursday, October 14, 1971 Comrade Enver Hoxha writes among others: The Communist Party of China has no confidence in the new Marxist-Leninist parties and groups which are being created, which are struggling and consolidating themselves, purging and tempering themselves. This is a revolutionary dialectical process. The Communist Party of China does not want to be stuck together with them, it is afraid of this and this is in conformity with its vacillating revisionist line. While not wanting to be stuck together with them, it wants all the other parties to praise it, to hold bilateral talks, but to avoid giving any aid to the entire movement of international communism. The Communist Party of China, with two or more lines in its ranks, maintains contact with any kind of party or group which allegedly calls itself Marxist-Leninist and which praises it. Whereas the party of labour of Albania, for its part, maintains a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist stand towards the world communist movement and Marxist-Leninist parties and groups, which it aids and supports, while it condemns those which deviate from Marxist-Leninist principles.

China Will Abandon the New Marxist-Leninist Parties One After the Other

In the note of Thursday, October 28, 1971, Comrade Enver Hoxha underlines: China will abandon the new Marxist-Leninist parties one after the other, pretending that "one bilateral meeting" and one talk are sufficient.

It began this abandonment publicly by its refusal to attend the 6th congress of our party, in which representatives of Marxist-Leninist parties and revolutionary groups will take part.

Of course for our party and the international communist movement the struggle becomes more onerous and difficult. But everything is clear to us, nothing can deceive us. We shall stand with our heads high, fighting in defence of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, against any one, even against all, if need be. Marxism-Leninism illuminates our road, it never leads us up a blind alley if we remain loyal to it. And our party will remain loyal to Marxism-Leninism, to its own people, socialism and communism.

The decision not to send a delegation of the CP of China to the 6th congress of the party of labour of Albania, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha in the note of Tuesday, November 9, 1971, was taken by Mao and Zhou Enlai because of opposition to our party over line. What is the basis of this opposition? This we have told them openly, like Bolsheviks. They do not speak about this, but gather up and distort what we say and then come out with non-Marxist public stands and reasons.

The fact is that they have lined themselves up with the revisionists, on a course towards conciliation and contacts with the revisionist parties of the world. Hence, for "political" expediency they have begun to adopt a two-faced stand, they have their hearts over there, while they have their stereotyped formulas, their posters on the gallery, because they still need them, here. It is understandable that Marxism-Leninism quickly shows up the trickery of opportunists who use phoney disguises.

Comrade Enver Hoxha exposes the policy of the C.P. of China for rapprochement with the revisionists of various countries. In the note of Friday, November 19, 1971 entitled:

Carrillo in China

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: The XINHUA News Agency reported that a delegation of the Spanish Revisionist Party of Passionaria, headed by the General Secretary Carrillo arrived in China and visited many of its cities.

Now it is clear that the Communist Party of China began the contacts, the talks and, why not, even the agreements. For the time being, perhaps these may be on certain problems, until they reach agreement on everything. After this meeting comes the turn of meetings with other revisionist parties, the Italian, French, British, Dutch, etc. This is a whole process in development.

On the one hand, the Communist Party of China is following the most openly opportunist road, allegedly maintains bilateral contacts with the communist and workers' parties (Marxist-Leninist) "just to listen to them and to be informed" but without assisting them, in particular, without supporting them ideologically in the struggle against revisionist parties and against other groups of anarchists and Trotskyites, while on the other hand, the Communist Party of China has begun and will continue to develop contacts and come to terms with the revisionist parties.

The other course which the Communist Party of China is pursuing is allegedly that of state relations in order to strengthen contacts with the revisionist parties in the countries where they are in power and which have contradictions with the Soviet Union and the revisionist party of the Soviet Union. At the same time, despite all these things it is doing, and precisely in order to disguise the true tactical and strategic aims of these revisionist and opportunist activities, the Communist Party of China "maintains relations" and proclaims to the world and trumpets that

"it is on the same line and in complete Marxist-Leninist unity with the party of labour of Albania" and by supporting us implies, that "we, too, are allegedly in agreement with many of its activities." This is a very cunning tactic.

The fact that one of the reasons they gave us for not coming to our 5th congress was "the large participation of the Marxist-Leninist parties," proves this very clearly. The telegram which they sent us for the congress, as well as for the 30th anniversary of the founding of the party, lauded to the skies this internationalism of our party and the support we give to the Marxist-Leninist parties. But as soon as this congress was over, they issued a communique which welcomed Carrillo of Ibarruri, who, when we defended Marxism-Leninism and attacked Soviet revisionism and Khrushchev at the Moscow meeting, called us "Trotskyites."

The welcoming of the revisionist group of Carrillo to Beijing will damage and raise many obstacles for the Communist Party of Spain (Marxist-Leninist), which is new. This will hinder it in the development and further consolidation of its positions. At the same time, such a thing will compel the Communist Party of Spain (Marxist-Leninist) to take a stand, either within the party, or in its propaganda, about the relations of the Communist Party of China with the revisionist party of Passionaria, because, in its press, the Revisionist Party of Spain will make the most of this success which it has scored in China. Undoubtedly it will say on this occasion, that "a bridge has been built to unity of the communist movement," that "there are no fundamental disagreements between it and the Communist Party of China," that "those few things which divide us were put aside and those which unite us were made the basis of our Marxist-Leninist collaboration," that "it was decided there should be no polemics between our two parties," and all the usual revisionist rubbish will follow in due course.

Although the communique issued by Beijing does not say these things, it implies them. The Chinese communique says only that their views should be put forward, but what are these views? Where are you and where are you not in agreement? It is supposed that they were in agreement, and if there were some things on which they were not in agreement, they were so unimportant that it was unnecessary to point them out. Thus, Carrillo and Passionaria wrapped things up very well.

The very same situation will be created for all the (Marxist-Leninist) communist parties when delegations from the revisionist parties of their countries go to China.

Hence, a new concrete danger threatens to undermine the new Marxist-Leninist parties in particular, which have still not strengthened and consolidated themselves internally. This of course, is a great danger for the international communist movement in the first place, therefore, the burden falls on our party, in particular, in cooperation and unity with the other Marxist-Leninist parties, to neutralize this danger and to triumph over it.

The Communist Party of China Is in a Revisionist Position

Is the title of the note on Sunday, February 13, 1972. Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: Geng Biao, former ambassador of China in our country, has now become an important personality in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. He heads the foreign directory and always appears in the press amongst the main leaders. It is possible that after this "purge," which has been carried out in the Political Bureau, one morning he will turn up as a member of it. He is a wily person, a capable "diplomat" and loyal to Zhou Enlai. Now Geng Biao welcomes and farewells the friends and comrades of the Communist Party of China, communists, revisionists and Trotskyites who visit China, and "lays down the line," of course, to those who accept it.

With us, that is, with our ambassador, he shows himself to be "on the best of terms," when he happens to meet him, he expresses the usual formulas. But when he meets the friends and comrades we have in common, in laying down the line to them, of course, he discards those formulas. When they return from China, some of the friends and comrades come and tell us that they are not in agreement but, thinking that we are "on the same line as the Chinese," want to justify their anti-Marxist stands.

The Frenchman Jacques Jurquet, the main leader of the Communist Party of France (Marxist-Leninist), who poses as being "illegal," has avoided meeting our comrades in Paris for six months since his return from Beijing. He did not come to our 6th congress, either, under the pretext of his "illegality."

Jurquet told our comrades that he had been charged by Zhou Enlai with finding a revisionist writer well known in France, who would write about China, just as they had acted in Italy, where a known revisionist, who had been to China, had been assisted to write a book. "And I," went on Jurquet to our comrades, "am working in the direction of the writer Chabrol, a known revisionist, whom I am trying to convince."

Our comrades asked Jurquet why revisionists should write about China because, Chabrol, notwithstanding that he has left the revisionist party of France, is still a revisionist, a man of the bourgeoisie and anything else you like.

This matter is of no great importance, stressed Jurquet, I also talked about the meeting and the discussion which the Chinese comrades had in China with Carrillo of the Communist Party (revisionist) of Spain. The discussion was fruitful, they told me, because the Spanish Revisionist Party has a correct foreign policy and also, has contradictions with the Soviets, therefore the Chinese will collaborate with Carrillo. The Chinese comrades are going to make contact with the Communist Party (revisionist) of Italy, too.

On the other hand, Comrade Enver Hoxha continues, a comrade of a communist party (Marxist-Leninist), who was in China, told us of his dissatisfaction over a number of points in the line of the Chinese comrades.

"The Chinese comrades," he told us, "sought information about many comrades of my country, and this astonished me. I asked them to inform me about the question of Lin Biao, etc., but they turned a deaf ear and did not tell me even one word. We discussed the question of Nixon's going to Beijing with the Chinese comrades, and gave them our view about American imperialism and our attitude towards it, an attitude which conforms completely with the line of the PLA. The views of the Chinese are different. They are for collaboration and joint action against another enemy, that is, they are for the theory that we can rely on the United States of America in order to fight the Soviets." "Finally," the comrade referred to said: "Zhou Enlai advised us to reconcile ourselves to and collaborate with the bourgeois government of the country. These are astonishing things," he said, "which will cause divisions amongst us, if I put them forward in the party."

It is clear that these and many other similar stands, show that China is not following a policy guided by Marxism-Leninism. Its policy is being brought into line, and will be brought even more into line with the policy of a great power, which is trying to consolidate its positions in the international arena, through friendships, through alliances, through pragmatic relations, not based on sound Marxist-Leninist principles and on the interests of socialism and the world revolution, but on the interests of a great powerful China, which calls itself socialist, but which is not socialist in reality.

The trend of the struggle which the Communist Party of China had declared against "leftists" is clear. This means struggle against those who adhere to principles, against those who want the struggle to be waged on the two fronts simultaneously: both against imperialism and against revisionism.

The Chinese pose as anti-revisionists, but they collaborate and are extending their collaboration with every revisionist trend, which allegedly has contradictions with the Soviet revisionists. Hence, in practice, they are united (and are united ideologically, too) with the revisionists to fight the Soviet revisionists.

[22 Jul 79]

[Text] Tirana, July 22 (ATA)--In the most detailed and argued way and through innumerable facts, Comrade Enver Hoxha's book "Reflections on China" throws light on the truth of the development of Sino-Albanian relations.

This book is a fierce indictment against the incorrect, unfriendly, dishonest, anti-Marxist and chauvinist stands of the Chinese leadership with Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai at the head, towards the party of labour of Albania and the PSR of Albania, stands which later on would reach to such

brutal anti-Albanian acts as the unilateral cessation of credits and economic and military aid for socialist Albania.

Were Our Enemies to Know That Between Us There Is no Consultation at All,
They Would Be Astonished

Since the first note of Tuesday, April 3, 1962 of the book "Reflections on China," Comrade Enver Hoxha stresses the lack of correctness on the part of the Chinese leadership about the consultations and the exchange of opinions with the party of labour of Albania in the fight against modern revisionists towards whom China had not come out as well as about principled problems of common interest.

Dwelling on this stand of the Chinese leadership, Comrade Enver Hoxha underlines among others in this note: This is an important problem, but up to now, the Chinese have not had any contact at all with us to discuss these things. Were our enemies to know that between us there is no consultation at all about the fight against the modern revisionists, they would be astonished. They would never believe it. But that is how things stand.

In face of the principled and resolute stands of the PLA, the Chinese leaders began the brutal pressures to force the PLA to renounce its correct stands. This appears clearly in the note of Wednesday, July 4, 1962. This note is entitled:

This Smells of Economic Pressure; We Must Guard Against Provocations

Comrade Hysni and Ramiz, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, have ended their work in China and are in Burma. They arrive in Rome on the 6th. On the majority of questions they were in agreement with the Chinese comrades, except over participation in the eventual meeting of the communist and workers' parties of the world. We maintained our position, the Chinese theirs.

At the meeting he had with our comrades, underlines Comrade Enver Hoxha, Zhou Enlai told them that it would be difficult for China to supply us with all the things on which agreements have been signed. Our comrades opposed this because it smelled of economic pressure. This is serious. However, we must await our comrades' return to judge it better.

We must be very cautious, We must be cool-headed and prudent, because the enemy is working intensively to divide us from China, trying to isolate us. We must guard against provocations, must measure our steps well, must not make the concession over principles and safeguard our friendship and links with China, because this has great importance for us and for international communism,

We Have Differences Over Tactics With the Chinese Comrades, and This We Have Not Hidden From Them

Is the title of the note of Sunday, December 23, 1962. It reads: At a dinner which the Chinese comrades put on in Peking for a group of our building specialists, amongst other things, in his speech Li Xiannian repeated that we would be quite unable to build the new projects which we receive from China and bring them into production at the time decided. Speaking about modern revisionism, he said that there were contradictions between the party of labour of Albania and the Communist Party of China (without specifying them), but they were in agreement on the general line.

What he said about the construction of the new projects is not true, because he has no facts at all, since the work is not even begun. He could have said that the Chinese are not delivering the blueprints on time. This is what is hindering and delaying the construction of the projects and it is Li Xiannian who is insisting on and spreading his baseless idea, also, among the other comrades of the Chinese leadership that we are allegedly incapable of building the new projects. For our part, we will mobilize ourselves and prove the opposite.

As for the contradictions, it would be more correct for him to say that we have differences over tactics, and they know of these, which we have not hidden from them. We cannot blindly follow the Communist Party of China in the forms and tempo of their actions.

Comrade Enver Hoxha condemns the vacillating stands of the Chinese leadership and points out the friendly and correct stand of the PLA towards China, which has openly and comradely expressed its opinions. The note of Friday, September 4, 1964 which deals with this, is entitled:

The Chinese Are Making Gross and Impermissible Mistakes

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes among others: We have the Chinese our reply in connection with the question of invitations to the celebration of the 15th anniversary of the proclamation of the republic. In the reply, we criticized them severely but justly, because they are making gross and impermissible mistakes.

We wrote that we consider incorrect the decision that, at the great celebration of the 15th anniversary of the proclamation of the People's Republic of China, in which many friends of China will take part, the official representatives of peoples most faithful to the Chinese people, the official representatives of communist and workers' parties which take a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist stand and which are fighting the most ferocious enemies, world imperialism and its modern revisionist agents, are excluded. This is an action which, at these moments, no tactical considerations, or especially the internal tactics amongst our parties, can justify. Neither our people nor our party will understand this.

We think that neither the fraternal Chinese people, nor the Chinese communists, will be pleased when they see that their closest friends are not present at their great celebration.

On the other hand, we think that this will be an astonishing thing, beyond understanding, for world opinion and will be interpreted at will, in many ways.

We wrote, you have taken this decision so that the revisionist renegades should not accuse you of holding a meeting before them, and hence accuse you as splitters. We think that such reasoning is not correct. The meeting which Khrushchev is organizing for the 15th of December has another character and aim, while the celebration of the People's Republic of China is the 15th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China and nothing else. The delegations which are invited to your celebration are not coming to hold special secret meetings, but to celebrate the 15th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China. It is natural that delegations of our parties might exchange opinions. This is our right and we are not afraid of anybody over this. The modern revisionists are holding hundreds of meetings on every possible occasion, and have not waited for us to hold meetings. In fact, we have not held any meeting which they could use to accuse us of being splitters. Despite this, the enemies have not failed to accuse us every day, but however they slander us, they do not frighten us. Slanders are second nature to them.

We think that with the decision you have taken about your celebration, you are creating a difficult situation for our celebration of the 20th anniversary of liberation.

Why should we create complicated situations for our parties and countries with our actions when the issues are clear?

We shall never stop our sacred ideological and political struggle against the modern revisionists with Tito and Khrushchev at the head. If we were to act differently, this would be a colossal mistake for us.

We tell the Chinese that we are convinced that the opinions which we express to them are sincere. We tell them what we think in an open and comradely way, because for them and for us, the great, sincere, Marxist-Leninist friendship between our parties and peoples stands above everything. We guard and shall always guard this friendship as the apple of our eye. True friendship is based on the great sincerity which exists between friends.

Possibly the Chinese comrades will not be at all (?pleased) with our criticism, but we can't help that, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha.

To invite states and parties to a national celebration is a political question and not a private matter, as if Mao were to invite a person, say, because his son was getting married. This action of the Chinese comrades does not appear to be fortuitous and unconsidered. There is more to this than meets the eye. We must wait and see.

Mao Zedong's Reply Is Not Right, It Is an Unprincipled, Incorrect, Slighting and Not at All Comradely Stand Towards the Central Committee of the PLA

For years on end, the leadership of the CP of China sought to avoid in maximum the confrontation of viewpoints and the exchange of opinions with the PLA adopting a "big party" chauvinist position. Bringing new facts on this stand of the Chinese leadership and exposing it, in the note of Tuesday, October 13, 1964, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

In reply to the question of the comrades of our party and government delegation, "We trust that you will give us your answer to our letter in connection with the borders of the Soviet Union," Comrade Mao said: "The future will prove whether we are right or wrong. We are not going to reply to you, because, if we did, we would reject your views as you rejected ours, and thus polemics would arise. Therefore, let us wait, perhaps, after many years we shall reply to you, but not now." (From the minutes of the talk with the Albanian party and government delegation, October 9, 1964, Central Archives of the party)

This reply is not right, it is an unprincipled, incorrect, slighting and not at all comradely stand towards the Central Committee of the party of labour of Albania. On the other hand, this reply shows that Comrade Mao does not like comradely criticism, therefore we must come to some conclusions:

The Chinese comrades not only reconfirm that Comrade Mao said what the Japanese socialists declared, but are maintaining their former positions towards us on these problems, and consider these positions correct. On the other hand, the fact is that their stands on these problems are not as resolute as they appear to be when they are confronted with our criticisms. The Chinese comrades, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, are avoiding bilateral consultations with us, as well as multilateral consultations.

It has always been our side which has sought exchanges of opinions on different problems with the Chinese comrades. We have always taken the initiative. They have not put forward problems from their side, but have discussed the problems which we have raised.

We shall continue this correct Marxist methods of work, we shall always tell the Chinese comrades of our views, even if this is hard for us and unpleasant for them. And we shall demand from them that discussions must be held about our views and not "avoided" from fear that "we shall get into polemics in this way." We are not afraid to discuss before engaging in polemics, and we have no reason to get into polemics when we have the possibility to discuss like Marxists and to convince each other with arguments and facts.

We must leave nothing "for history to resolve." We must solve those things which are up to us, and solve them correctly, while history can give its judgment later about the solutions which our parties give them.

[23 Jul 79]

[Text] Tirana, July 23 (ATA)--It Will Be Impossible To Prevent the Disagreements With the Chinese, Which Have Begun on Ideological and Political Questions, From Influencing Our Economic Relations With Them

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha reflects the correct stand of the PLA towards the Chinese viewpoints and stands. At the same time he foresees as early as 1964 that the Chinese leadership, just like Khrushchev, will adopt hostile and anti-Albanian stands. In the note of Saturday, October 31, 1964, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes among others: We must be very, very vigilant, and continue to struggle resolutely. We shall encounter many difficulties, they will isolate us, but with struggle we shall break out of the encirclement, because Marxism-Leninism cannot be isolated or suppressed.

We must do the maximum, which principle permits, to avoid coming out openly against the Communist Party of China, but indirectly, after a time, there is no way to prevent the split from becoming obvious. This has its harmful aspects, but also its good aspects. The just struggle we have waged up to now against revisionists has opened the eyes of many people in the world, and they are able to understand quickly who is on the right road and who is not. We must use both methods. To the Chinese we must openly express our views on everything, we must point out clearly our disagreements, everything about which we are not of one opinion with them, while in the press we must publicly maintain an open stand on every problem, without mentioning the Chinese and regardless of whether it will be understood that it is directed against the Chinese views and stands. This is the only correct, Marxist-Leninist course. Wherever our opinions on certain actions are compatible, we shall be in accord, wherever we are not of one opinion we shall never be in agreement. If things reach the point of the breaking of relations and for our differences to come out in the open, let the Chinese do this, let them use even the Khrushchevite arsenal, if they want to. Then our fire, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha, will reply to them differently.

Further on he writes: Cautiously and progressively, we must make the party aware of this new situation, must strengthen and temper the party and the people, and arm them for possible dangers in the future, and must strengthen our management of the economy. We must re-examine the draft-plan more closely in connection with these situations which exist, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha. It will be impossible to prevent the disagreement with the Chinese, which have begun on ideological and political questions, from influencing our economic relations with them. Perhaps the effect will not come immediately and brutally, as Khrushchev acted, but the

coercion, delays and pressures will come gradually. Therefore we must not go blindly into investments and constructions, into an extensive development, because such a thing could break our backs, we must not become dependent on the credits they might grant us, because they might slow them down and cut them off at the moment they find most appropriate.

We must follow events and situations with great care, must be cool-headed, must always preserve our aplomb. If up till now we have had to be patient and cool-headed ten times over, from now on we must be much more so, because the dangers will be more numerous, the situations more complicated, and the enemy cunning, strong and powerful. Our responsibility will become even greater to our own people, as well as in the international arena, to the international communist movement. It is not a matter of giving ourselves importance. We must preserve our Marxist modesty. Although we are small, a small party, a small people, we must perform the role and the task that belong to us honourably, courageously, valiantly, and to the end, to victory.

Comrade Enver Hoxha condemns the departure with every passing day of the C.P. of China from the Marxist-Leninist positions sliding deeper and deeper into the big power chauvinist positions. At the same time he exposes the efforts of the Chinese to impose their wrong opinions and actions on the PLA. In the note of Tuesday, November 3, 1964 entitled:

The Chinese Want To Impose Their Opinions on Us

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: The Chinese comrades are not behaving like Marxists and with modesty towards our criticisms. They are angry and their stands towards us are neither Marxist nor correct. They are displeased that we are not following them in the actions which they have decided to undertake with the Soviets. The Chinese want and are trying to impose their mistaken opinions and actions in this direction on us. They do not even agree to prior discussions with us about the common stands that should be maintained in the common interest.

In the new situation which was created after the fall of Khrushchev, a consultation was absolutely essential.

Before any change, the leaders of the communist and workers' parties meet, discuss, define their stands and take decisions. This is essential. The problem is of a general character for the world communist movement, it does not have the character of a specific interest for a particular party, therefore it was essential to hold a joint consultation at which the views of our parties would be put forward and discussed so we could come out with a common stand.

It is absurd and unacceptable that, without such a preliminary consultation, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China should come out and say to us: "This is how I judge matters, this is what I have decided, therefore you must follow me like a pet lamb."

These are anti-Marxist methods which they themselves have condemned when others have wanted to impose them on us through the "conductor's baton." Now they are forgetting these evil actions of others, are adopting them without the slightest shame, and using them as if there were nothing wrong in this.

Of course, the refusal on our part ever to accept these wrong methods and stands leads to quarrels, disagreements, splits, and differences, and if errors are not caught in time, and if they are not understood and corrected immediately by those who make them, they get worse and gradually the road of Khrushchev is adopted.

What is impelling the Chinese to fall into this error of principle which is so simple and easily understood, but which has grave consequences for them and the international communist movement?

Petty-bourgeois conceit. This shows that the Chinese leadership is not so essentially modest as it pretends to be and as it says it is.

The spirit of great state and big party chauvinism. [sentence as received] There is no speech and article in which they don't "denounce" these dangerous anti-Marxist views as such. They are constantly accusing the Soviet revisionists of this sin. But how can you describe their disdain for the other parties, for their opinions, individuality and dignity, such as Zhou Enlai displayed, when in other words, he said, "pack your suitcase and go to Moscow--to Canossa." These things cannot be described as anything but great-state and big-party chauvinism. Zhou Enlai's outlook must not be different from that of Kossygin, when the latter tried to convince me not to express our opinions at the Moscow meeting in 1960, by saying to me: "You must bear in mind the prestige of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." And I replied to Kossygin: "I love the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and I am protecting its prestige which you, yourselves, are violating. However, you, too, must consider the prestige of the party of Labour of Albania."

The Chinese leaders consider, unrealistically, that the whole "victory" and "glory" in the exposure of Khrushchev and his elimination from the political scene belongs to them, that the others have been, as you might say, their "drummer-boys." Thus, they have made their judgments and decisions, prompted not by Marxist modesty, but by big-party chauvinism. Literally exposing the brutal pressure of the Chinese leadership, Comrade Enver Hoxha underlines further on: Just as Marxism-Leninism struck one "conductor's baton" an iron blow to the head, it will strike an equally powerful blow at another "conductor's baton," or at two "conductor's batons" together, or a combined clique of other conductors.

So, Chinese comrades, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha, I am convinced that you are wrong, terribly wrong, and you should pull back from these mistakes, which will become dangerous, very dangerous. Later. We, as Marxists, are greatly interested that you should not make mistakes, but

although we are small, although our party is a small party, although our people are a small people, no one has the power to shut our mouths, to stop us telling the truth, defending the truth, defending Marxism-Leninism.

The Chinese Leadership Has Blundered Into a Blind Alley

In the note of Sunday, November 15, 1964 Comrade Enver Hoxha, exposing the silence of the Chinese about the results of Zhou Enlai's visit to Moscow, writes among others:

Nothing is leaking out. To their Albanian comrades, the Chinese are maintaining dead silence. Naturally, this is not in order, neither friendly, comradely, nor Marxist. Meanwhile the revisionists, for their part, have reported to one another and are co-ordinating their actions. The Chinese comrades did not make the effort to inform us, even in a confidential way, about the content of the letter which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China received from the Soviets in connection with the demotion of Khrushchev. This shows, of course, and we cannot interpret it otherwise, that the Chinese comrades are maintaining reserve towards us to this degree. Meanwhile, the disregard of the Chinese to reply to our letter on the question of their borders with the Soviet Union, their not deigning to tell us whether they have retracted the great gaffe they made before Chervonenko in connection with us, and the fact that they are not giving the slightest indication about the memorandum which we sent them in connection with "the situation created after the fall of Khrushchev," show openly that the Chinese leadership is not in order with us, it has blundered into a blind alley.

The Chinese Press Is Silent About Our Articles and Publishes the Speeches of Soviet Leaders

Is the title of the note of Wednesday, November 18, 1964. It reads: The Chinese press has remained almost totally silent. Even those articles which it has written during this time since the fall of Khrushchev are spineless. It has published only the speeches of the new Soviet leaders and some quotations "without clear content" from the speeches by some leader of the Communist Party of Indonesia. In regard to the reprinting of our articles, from the fall of Khrushchev up till now, nothing has been done, either in the official newspapers or even in the internal bulletins, or even as simple news. Nothing. Hence it is clear that in essence they are in opposition to our views, that they have a new line, that they have adopted a new stand following the fall of Khrushchev, and that they have issued directives to the party and the people about this new stand. Thus it is clear that they do not want to inform Chinese opinion about our views.

Not the Slightest Sign of Self-Criticism

Dwelling on the verbal communication of the Chinese ambassador in Tirana about Zhou Enlai's talks in Moscow, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes in the note of Tuesday, November 21, 1964:

On the instructions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, the Chinese ambassador in Tirana communicated to us verbally about Zhou Enlai's talks in Moscow. These things we knew, but they listed them point by point. Not the slightest sign of self-criticism (but they have thought that this communication of theirs which was a hundred and eighty degree turn might be considered a self-criticism).

In a word, the Chinese ambassador made things a bit easier for Li Xiannian who will come to the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the liberation of our homeland.

[24 Jul 79]

[Text] Tirana, July 24 (ATA)--The party of labour of Albania withstood with courage the pressure of the leadership of the C.P. of China taking into account also the possibility of economic measures, with which the Chinese side, in different ways and forms, threatened Albania time and again. In the note of Saturday, September 24, 1966, entitled:

We Must Avoid Being Taken by Surprise

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: Each day that goes by brings us fresh worries about the course on which events are developing in China. From the reports we are receiving we learn that the Chinese are meeting serious opposition in the development of the cultural revolution, the activities of the "Red Guard" and the propagation of the cult of Mao. The students from the various countries who are in China follow the line of their own parties. That is why the Chinese have chosen the course of sending them away allegedly for one year.

Politically this is a great mistake. The Chinese with full conviction and an easy conscience think that they are doing well, but with this they are inflicting losses and isolation on themselves. This shows another dangerous thing, namely, that they are not concerned what others may say. In a word, they imply to others, "We are going about our own business, and it does not worry us what others think, we are a big country, a big party, we know what we are doing, and what we are doing we are doing correctly, follow us if you like, if not, that's your affair."

The major fact that the Communist Party of China has not even informed us about what is going on in China and what they have decided to do, confirms this anti-Marxist stand. This means: read our newspapers, approve us, and follow us,

The Chinese in Tirana Have Begun To Carry Out the First Provocations Which Remind Us of the Old Methods of Titoites and Khrushchevites

Seeing our correct reaction, that we cannot follow them in their dubious excesses, the Chinese, through their people in Tirana, have begun to carry

out the first provocations, which remind us of the old methods of the Titoites and the Khrushchevites. The Chinese go through our country and buttonhole people, one after the other; "to interview" them on what they think about the cultural revolution, about Mao, and the "Red Guard." These "interviews" have two aims: first, they are to be printed in Beijing to serve in the "great orchestra," and second, to urge our people to speak about these problems and to create suspicions that "the Albanian leadership is opposing the 'ardent' desire of people in Albania." Naturally, these "Chinese correspondents" have not achieved their objective. But they continue to work in this direction.

Today the Chinese students who are studying in our country sought permission to prepare "an exhibition to show what foreigners are saying about Mao Zedong." This is an open provocation against us, who do not agree to shout hosannas for Mao. Our youth put them in their place, carefully but clearly.

These are the "first needlings," but if their line is not rectified they might go even further with us. We have had bitter experience, therefore we must not be caught unawares.

In the Construction of the Projects of the 4th Five Year Plan We Must Proceed Cautiously, So That If "the Chinese Leave Us in the Lurch" It Will Be Possible for Us To Complete Them Ourselves

In this situation the need arises to re-examine one by one, in detail, but without any publicity, the projects of the 4th Five-Year Plan, with which China is supplying us on credits. We must examine this whole thing in the dynamic of the Chinese commitment to build the projects and the possibility that China might cut off the credits or create difficulties for us, or postpone the construction of projects at a time when we have committed large material and monetary funds to them. Therefore, in the construction of these projects we must proceed cautiously, from the simplest to the biggest, so that if "they leave us in the lurch" it will be possible for us to complete them ourselves. On these things, of course, we still shall have time to see the political predispositions of the Chinese more clearly.

I have confidence that the Chinese comrades will not reach the point of adopting this course with us, but I foresee that if they continue on this line we shall have even political and ideological frictions, this depends on them, because we shall not budge from our Marxist-Leninist line, from our open and sincere friendship on the Marxist-Leninist road.

In continuation of his notes, Comrade Enver Hoxha criticizes the stand of the Chinese leadership, which avoided contacts with the party of labour of Albania. In the note of Tuesday, January 16, 1968, entitled:

China Is Silent Again. The Period of Isolation Has Recommenced

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: We have almost no contact with the Chinese comrades and do not know officially what is occurring there since the visit of our delegation. The period of isolation has recommenced. They withdrew their ambassador in Tirana, because he turned out to be implicated in the activities of the Liu-teng [as received] group. When will another come to replace him? There is no sign--perhaps after a year, or even two. However, in reality it is all the same, with or without an ambassador, because even when the Chinese Embassy in Tirana has its titular head, no one hears him, no one meets him and he does not seek to hold any conversation with us. He is more like a master of ceremonies.

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha points out: How is the cultural revolution developing, what is occurring and what is being done internally, what does China think about world problems? We know nothing for sure. Even our ambassador in Beijing has no official contact to receive information on these problems. He is left with only what he can learn from some dazibao, or some newspaper of the "Red Guard," full of rumours and contradictory stands--saying one thing today and something else tomorrow.

All the Contacts Are Glacial

In the note of Thursday, April 25, 1968, Comrade Enver Hoxha again dwells on the frozen stands of the Chinese leadership. He writes: Even with us, their closest friends, all contacts are glacial. They don't allow our ambassador in Beijing any meeting, he is isolated. An astonishing situation.

They do not expect to send a delegation for the May Day celebrations as usual, allegedly because they are occupied with the cultural revolution. "Please understand us, Albanian comrades," they say, but we do not understand their attitude at all. If the People's Republic of China goes on like this, then the outlook is gloomy. They have not invited any delegation from our side either. A proletarian state. The celebration of proletarians. It carries out the proletarian cultural revolution. Indeed "the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution," and does not celebrate it, does not invite anyone because it is occupied with this "revolution." This, too, is astonishing. Then why declare that you have taken power everywhere and the internal situation "is excellent?" Let it be so. This is what we ardently want, but to us, as Marxists, the situation is not clear.

They Invite Us to Their Celebration But There Is Nobody To Receive Us

Is the title of the note of Tuesday, September 9, 1969 in which Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: Comrade Nesti Nase informed us of the invitation which the PR of China extended to us to take part in the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the proclamation of the republic. They invite us but, at the same time, add, "the comrades in Beijing are extremely busy, we are preparing for war," "we are not going to have a big celebration, however, we are inviting you because you are our brothers," etc.

Astounding things. In one word, they want to say: "Send a second-rate delegation." The Chinese ambassador, who has just come to our country and whom we have not yet seen "will go to Beijing to welcome our delegation," because supposedly there is no one to receive it there. Meanwhile, here, in the embassy of the PR of China, they say that they will give a big reception to which they will invite all our leadership, but the ambassador himself will not be there. For three years their embassy has been without an ambassador. The two who were here before this one, have been arrested, and this one who has just arrived, instead of remaining at his post, "is to go to Beijing to welcome our delegation." They are doing many astonishing things.

We must send a delegation headed by a member of the Political Bureau such as Comrade Haki Toska, for example.

They Get Up to Such Tricks

In the note of Friday, September 19, 1969, dwelling on the meeting Comrade Rita Marko had with Zhou Enlai, Comrade Enver Hoxha exposes the intrigues of the Chinese leadership towards the P.L.A. he writes among others:

Zhou Enlai was so irritated during his talk with Comrade Rita and defended his opinion with such heat (of course, because he was angry with Rita, and obviously with our leadership that opposed his views) that, although he had invited Rita to a banquet, he did not propose any toast to our leadership. Could this have been an oversight? I don't believe so. It was pressure. When he "forgot," why did Kang Shien not remind him? He had many ways to do so.

Further on Comrade Enver Hoxha points out: The following morning both Kang Shien and Li Xiannian, each of them individually, took Comrade Rita aside at the airport when he was about to leave and begged his pardon on behalf of Zhou Enlai, who at the banquet the evening before "had forgotten" to propose a toast to the health of Comrade Enver, TC. They get up to such tricks.

But the refrain of the trickery continues. What I said above about Comrade Rita occurred on the 12th of September. On the 18th of September, the ambassador of China here gave a lunch for the leadership of the China-Albania Friendship Association and strangely enough, the Chinese ambassador did not propose a toast to our leadership either, although it was up to him to do such a thing. This astounded us, because we still did not know that the same thing had occurred with Comrade Rita in Beijing. But now we understand the set-up: the Chinese ambassador acted in this way so that his guests would not propose toasts to Mao Zedong, and taking advantage of this opportunity, he would report that the Albanians did not propose a toast to Mao. Zhou Enlai would report this to the leadership saying: "The Albanians are vengeful, hence, we are one-all. I, Zhou Enlai, did this unwittingly, while the Albanians did it

deliberately." What intrigues. There is no other explanation for these things, which should never occur.

Briefly, these are the main things which emerge from Comrade Rita's talk, although there are many other details which figure in the minutes of the meeting of our Political Bureau, which also have their importance.

We must find the way to tell the Chinese comrades our views clearly and frankly about this question which has great importance both for China and for us, and for our common general stand. We will tell them these things in a comradely way, and our aim is to help to stop this unhealthy course which can have grave consequences within China and in the world.

A Talk With the Chinese Ambassador

On Wednesday, October 1, 1969 Comrade Enver Hoxha writes in his diary about the talk he had with the Chinese ambassador in Tirana.

After the Chinese ambassador had delivered his speech and proposed the toast to the 20th anniversary of the proclamation of the People's Republic of China, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha among others, I opened the conversation with him about the meeting which was held in Beijing between Zhou Enlai and Kosygin. Apparently he expected this, because I observed that his interpreter, when I was speaking a little earlier, translated everything directly, without taking notes, brought out his pen and notebook when I began to speak on this question. So much the better, but it depends how faithfully my words were translated.

Naturally, I prefaced my remarks before launching into the theme. I said more or less: Comrade Rita reported to us about the conversation he had with Comrade Zhou Enlai in Beijing. We tell you sincerely, as comrades, that we do not find this unexpected meeting which Zhou Enlai had with Kosygin in Beijing, correct or opportune. This meeting at such a high level, in these circumstances and moments favourable for China and unfavourable for the Soviet revisionists, seems to us a mistake.

Chen Po-ta [as received] Was Cordial With Our Delegation

Is the title of the note of Tuesday, October 14, 1969. Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: Comrade Haki (Toska) reported to us that, in general, he has been received well, particularly among the people and in the provinces, he has been received very well, exceptionally warmly, with affection just as before. Chen Po-ta, who accompanied him to Nanking, proved to be very friendly, very cordial, very warm.

At the celebrations in Beijing the "new protocol" established was somewhat in evidence. He met Mao and Lin Biao in passing on the Tien An Men tribune, because they "were very busy."

Our delegation had talks with Zhou Enlai and Kang Shien. Zhou Enlai defended his views and Haki defended ours. Each side maintained its own standpoint in regard to the Zhou-Kosygin meeting.

Is Li Xiannian the Only One Who Should Come to Albania?

Today, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha in his note of Sunday, November 23, 1969, Beijing announced that the Chinese delegation, which will come to take part in our celebration of the 25th anniversary of the liberation of our homeland, will be headed by Li Xiannian. This is the fourth or the fifth time that Li Xiannian has been sent at the head of the Chinese delegations which come to our country, as if great China allegedly has no other comrades who ought to come and see Albania, too. This is astounding, to say the least. This is not important to us, but we wonder, ought Li Xiannian be the only one to come to Albania? He will stay here only a week and in fact will have only one day free to travel through Albania. Let him go to see the Vau I Dejes hydro-power station, which he has not seen.

In the note of Thursday, December 4, 1969 Comrade Enver Hoxha exposes the stand of the Chinese leadership, which through various ways and forms threatened the party of labour of Albania. The note is entitled:

Ideas Which Are Not Li Xiannian's Alone

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: In his conversation on the way to Fier, Li Xiannian hinted to Mehmet that they are preparing for war, hence war industry occupies the main place in China, that the Chinese are assisting South Vietnam and North Vietnam, which has been heavily damaged, and that they (the old refrain) are worried about the labour force in our country, lest we are impoverishing the countryside. On his part, all this "discourse" was made in order to tell us: "Don't seek anymore aid from us." He stressed that the things he was saying were "his own opinions," of which he has many, but none of which he had expressed up till then. We know that these are not only his opinions, Mehmet gave him the proper reply.

[25 Jul 79]

[Text] Tirana, July 25 (ATA)--In the note of Saturday, December 6, 1969, Comrade Enver Hoxha condemns the adverse, evil, provocative and unfriendly mission of Li Xiannian and his delegation, which had come to Albania on occasion of the 25th anniversary of the liberation. The note is entitled:

Li Xiannian and His Delegation

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

We expected that a delegation worthy of the deep, pure and sincere feelings, the great love we have for People's China, its communist party and Chairman Mao, would come to our great celebration of the 25th anniversary of liberation from our "great, beloved, Marxist-Leninist" ally.

What did they send us? Who came at the head of the delegation? A gloomy individual, a person who is criticized so severely by the cultural revolution, that we are astonished that he remains where he is (only in China do these "miracles" occur even when such "revolutions" are being carried out), a person who has never shown himself to be sincere and well-intentioned towards the People's Republic of Albania and the Marxist-Leninist line of our party. This person was Li Xiannian, the friend and righthand man of Zhou Enlai, who certainly not only saved him from the purges but kept him where he was before, and indeed increased his "renown" and power even further.

The Chinese Delegation Was Negative From Every Point of View

Hence, Li Xiannian came to Albania rather as the envoy of Zhou Enlai than as the envoy of the Communist Party of China. He acted and behaved here up to Zhou Enlai's instructions and orders. He behaved towards us much worse than Zhou Enlai himself would have behaved, because this one is very clever, very diplomatic. While Li Xiannian's face as well as his words, his actions, his attitudes, his gestures showed clearly what he had in his heart and mind, his mission was very adverse, evil, provocative and unfriendly.

Thus the Chinese delegation was negative from every point of view.

In China there are people, disguised revisionists, who are not in agreement with the correct, consistent, revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist line of our party, who are not in agreement with the prestige and authority which our party has won and is winning, day by day, in the international communist movement. They are striving in vain to make us accept certain principles and stands which are politically and ideologically wrong, both on their internal plane and on the international plane, in order to give the impression that our party is tailing behind their party and to make it de facto an appendage of their party.

Of course, we do not easily fall into such traps. We not only defend the independence and individuality of our party, but also we defend our line and develop it on the Marxist-Leninist road. Such a development automatically brings to light our contradictions with them in many questions.

We have not failed to point out our views on many things in a comradely way. They have accepted them, have not rejected them, because our views have been well-founded and principled, but in essence they have not been pleased. They appear modest, but they are not very modest, especially

certain leaders of the Communist Party of China. They ask for criticisms, but in fact they are very embittered at our criticism, especially certain leaders who even bear grudges and take revenge if they get the opportunity.

However, it is a fact that all these contradictions have not given rise to open antagonisms, apart from the open opposition we had when they attempted on two successive occasions to make us reach agreements with the Soviets. We opposed this rigorously.

We think that some Chinese leaders have not forgotten this stand of ours, but they had no reason to express their ire so openly through the delegation they sent to our celebration.

We Have Always Had Friction Over Line With Zhou Enlai

It was all the same to us whoever would come to the celebration, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, but knowing Li Xiannian, and since it was the fifth time he came to our country, we had the right to doubt and say: "Has China no other comrade to send us on this great day? Has China no one left but Li Xiannian?" It was our duty to make him very welcome, but also we had to be careful.

How did Li Xiannian behave in face of the great enthusiasm of the people, the cadres, and our leading comrades? As cold as ice, he barely greeted them, was frowning, did not speak if he was not spoken to, when we tried to open conversation with him, he replied, with a "yes," "no," and with stale formulas.

...But why this unfriendly stand, to say the least of it? This was a premeditated stand prepared in advance. Why? Whom does it serve? And for what reason?

Without any doubt this stand is dictated by Zhou Enlai, we believe, because Li Xiannian is his man. We have always had friction over line with Zhou Enlai. Mao saved Zhou from the cultural revolution. Zhou himself says that he has made great mistakes. He says this with his mouth, but not with his heart. This is the issue, and this is the basis of the opposition to us, opposition over line, this is the foundation of it. Then events happen one after the other and prove that we are right and not he, and this has made him angry with us.

Can it be our opposition to the Zhou Enlai-Kosygin meeting which dictated this stand of Li Xiannian? Partly yes, but not entirely. There must be something bigger concealed and this must have its source in an internal struggle, which must be going on in their leadership.

A Blameworthy Attempt To Hinder the Construction of the Fierza Hydro-power Station

Is the title of the note of Wednesday, December 1970 in which Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

The deputy-minister of energy of China has been here at the head of a team for about two weeks in order to look into and assist us in the matter of our hydropower stations. Some days ago, she had two or three meetings with Comrade Rahman Hanku, who is engaged with these matters, and raised with him these problems:

- 1) The Fierza hydro-power station cannot be built at the place decided and where work is going on....
- 2) We will not complete the "Mao Zedong" hydro-power plant at the date we have set, its dam is unsafe and might jeopardize the name of Mao.

Rahman Hanku categorically rejected all this as unfounded and unacceptable from our side.

...Such an effort to hinder the construction of the Fierza hydro-power plant is to be condemned. An uncomradely, very bad way of acting. Despite our friendship, we must be vigilant.

In continuation of his notes Comrade Enver Hoxha analyses new facts and sternly denounces the hostile, anti-Marxist stand of the Chinese leadership towards the P.L.A. In the note of Thursday, October 14, 1971, which appears under the Title:

The Communist Party of China Is Not Sending a Delegation to the 6th Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: The Chinese ambassador in Tirana communicated this news to us and Geng Biao communicated it to our ambassador in Beijing. We did not expect such a thing. It never crossed our minds that the Communist Party of China would make such a public "challenge" to our party.

The Reasons Are Without Foundation, Incorrect, and Some of Them Are Lies

What are the reasons they gave?

- 1) That at their last congress they decided not to invite delegations of sister parties to their congresses and not to send delegations of the Communist Party of China to the congresses of sister parties.
- 2) That the international communist movement at present is not as it was before, many Marxist-Leninist parties and groups, which have not yet confirmed themselves and appear to be divided, have been formed, and indeed in various countries there two or three such parties, etc.

3) That the comrades of the leadership are very occupied with state and internal party affairs at present and are unable to leave their country, etc.

These are the famous reasons which they give for not coming to the 6th congress of our country. All these reasons, stresses Comrade Enver Hoxha, are without foundation, incorrect and some of them are lies. Let us analyse them one by one.

We Know Well the Vacillations in Line of the Chinese

The congress of the Communist Party of China has not taken such a decision as they claim. It is logical that the Central Committee or the Political Bureau should make such a decision. Such a decision could be taken, but at definite moments and in specific instances, and should not become a principle as it is put to us by the Chinese comrades. They decided not to invite delegations to the 9th congress of their party. This is normal and no one could oppose it. They could also have taken a decision, as they did, not to come to the 6th congress of our party. From the formal aspect this is a right they have, but it is not permissible for them to lie about it. The Central Committee, the Political Bureau, or certain leaders may have taken the decision not to send a delegation to the congress of our party, but not the 9th congress of the Communist Party of China. With this uncouth manoeuvre they want to cover up the action of the leadership by calling it the implementation of the decision of the 9th congress of their party, that is "cutting off one's nose to spite one's face." This decision was taken recently, in the middle of September. Two events prove this:

A) In June, they told a comrade of the Communist Party of Poland who was in China and wanted to come to Albania: "Stay until October and go together with the delegation of our party which will go to the congress of the party of labour of Albania."

B) An Indonesian comrade asked us two or three days ago: With what airline can I come to Tirana to take part in the 6th congress of the PLA, because the Chinese comrades told me previously that I could come together with the Chinese delegation which was to be headed by Li Xiannian, but now they have informed me that they are not going to send a delegation.

Thus, these facts prove that this is not a decision of the congress, that a decision to send a delegation to the 6th congress of our party had been taken and was retracted following the letter which we sent to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, in which we expressed our opinion in connection with Nixon's going to Beijing. It also turns out that this decision was taken after September 1, when the manifestations and parades in Tien An Men were stopped and cancelled, when an aircraft crashed deep in Mongolian territory, when military and civil flights were banned in China, the airports closed, etc.

These things are true, while the name of Lin Biao, in fact, has not been mentioned at all since that time, in the speeches of the Chinese at receptions which are given either in China or outside. The Chinese ambassador here, who mentioned the name of Lin Biao together with that of Mao at every moment, now does not mention even the latter so that the void will not be noticed.

There is a great deal of speculation in the outside world about this question and the main rumour goes like this: Lin Biao and his comrades have been eliminated because they opposed Nixon's going to Beijing. Then, if this is true (we think it must be true), the failure to send a delegation to the 6th congress of our party is opposition to our party on matters of principle. We are convinced of this because we are well aware of the waverings in line of the Chinese and the revisionist position of the group of Zhou Enlai, who, in fact, has triumphed over the others and operates assisted by Mao and under his shadow.

Hence, the views we expressed in our letter have coincided with the views of the Lin Biao group.

We came to the conclusion that they would give us their reply to the letter orally, through the leader of their delegation which would come to the congress of our party, on which the decision had been taken. Apparently, however, their internal affairs were complicated "with the opposition of the Lin Biao group." If we accept this version, then it can be said that the question was complicated for them because "they condemned Lin Biao over the problem of Nixon," which means that they are in opposition over principles to our line about this question, and if they had come to the congress of our party, then they would have had to give us the reply to the letter which we sent them in connection with Nixon's visit to China, but at the same time would have had to tell us the reasons for "the condemnation of Lin Biao." This would not have worked out for them, therefore it is supposed that they found they way out by not sending the delegation, in order to avoid making matters worse in relations with our party.

(At the meeting of the Political Bureau, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, I submitted a series of other arguments which confirm the correct line of our party and the revisionist views of the leadership of the Communist Party of China, therefore I do not want to dwell any further on this point.)

The Communist Party of China Has No Confidence in the New Marxist-Leninist Parties

The second reason which the Chinese comrades give for not sending a delegation of the Communist Party of China to the congress of our party does not hold water at all. We are holding the congress of the party of labour of Albania and not a meeting of international communism. Hence, you are coming to the 6th congress of the party of labour of Albania and not to some meeting of the Marxist-Leninist parties of the world. You, the

Communist Party of China, have taken the decision not to invite sister parties to your congress and this is a matter which is up to you, while the party of labour of Albania has decided to invite delegations and this is a matter which is up to it.

But the fundamental problem does not lie in this right, it lies elsewhere: the Communist Party of China has no confidence in the new Marxist-Leninist parties and groups which are being created, which are struggling and consolidating themselves, purging and tempering themselves. This is a revolutionary dialectical process. The Communist Party of China does not want to be stuck together with them, it is afraid of this and this is in conformity with its vacillating revisionist line. While not wanting to be stuck together with them, it wants all the other parties to praise it, to hold bilateral talks, but to avoid giving any aid to the entire movement of international communism. The Communist Party of China, with two or more lines in its ranks, maintains contact with any kind of party or group which allegedly calls itself Marxist-Leninist and which praises it. Whereas the party of labour of Albania, for its part, maintains a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist stand towards the world communist movement and Marxist-Leninist parties and groups, which it aids and supports, while it condemns those which deviate from Marxist-Leninist principles.

Anti-Marxist Action of the Chinese Leadership

In regard to the third reason which the Chinese give, if we accept the version that disturbances, of which I have written, have occurred in the leadership of the Communist Party of China, then the reason for the failure of the delegation of this party to come is explained. But if nothing serious has occurred, to say that "we are not sending a delegation because the comrades are very busy," this is not only absurd, but also hostile towards the party of labour of Albania. (I explained this situation in greater detail in a meeting of the Political Bureau and I don't need to extend on it.)

Every cloud has a silver lining. Reaction and the revisionists will make the most of this anti-Marxist action of the leadership of the Communist Party of China, but the international communist movement will judge how right our party has been in its line and how wrong the Communist Party of China is on this question.

The world will see, also, and will judge that Albania is indomitable, that the party of labour of Albania is indomitable. Within our country, the failure to send a delegation of the Communist Party of China to the congress of our party will not have any negative effect, on the contrary, our party and our people, who have passed through so many tempests, will become stronger and more steeled. The unity amongst us will reach its highest, the enthusiasm of the people for the party will be indescribable.

For the international communist movement, of course, this opportunist revisionist line of the Communist Party of China is not good, because it weakens and confuses it. But everything will be overcome.

Dwelling on the support and backing the P.L.A. has given to the C.P of China and the P.R. of China in the international arena, in the note of Tuesday, October 26, 1971, entitled:

The Admission of China to the United Nations Organization

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes: The vote was taken yesterday, at midnight, and our resolution, which sought the admission of the P.R. of China to the United Nations organization with its full rights and the expulsion from this organization of the corpse of Chiang Kai-shek, won with 76 votes in favour. The American resolution got only 35 votes. American imperialism suffered a major political defeat. The courageous, consistent and stern struggle against the United States of America was led by the People's Republic of Albania.

A small but indomitable socialist country triumphed over the most powerful imperialist state.

Our party defended China with all its strength.

Our stands toward China, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, have always been principled, open and sincere, notwithstanding that many of its stands and actions, in various situations, have been unclear, opportunist and revisionist. We did not lose confidence in the Communist Party of China, but we guarded and guard the Marxist-Leninist principles like the apple of our eye and have never failed to state our comradely disapproval whenever it has been necessary, regardless of how this would be received.

The correct, revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist line of our party and government, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha further on, in the world diplomatic field was a powerful contribution to the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations organization.

This great international event will have major consequences in world problems. A great deal depends on the policy which the People's Republic of China will follow. If it pursues a wise, skilful and, especially, a principled Marxist-Leninist policy, then this will be greatly to the advantage of the revolution and the liberation struggles of the peoples.

As far as we are concerned, we shall continue our course, our line, our fight for the defence of Marxism-Leninism, socialism and communism.

The Chinese comrades must not forget or underestimate this, and this ought to make them recognize their great mistake and feel ashamed that they are not going to send a delegation to the 6th congress of our party, the party which has always been beside them in the most difficult moments of their existence. But after all, we only did our duty as a Marxist-Leninist party and socialist state.

[26 Jul 79]

[Text] Tirana, July 26 (ATA)--In the note of Tuesday, November 9, 1971, Comrade Enver Hoxha condemns the base stand of the Chinese leadership towards the 6th congress of the party of labour of Albania. Under the title:

The Chinese Comrades and the 6th Congress of Our Party

Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

The 6th congress of the party ended with extraordinary success. This congress displayed the internal unity of the party and the party-people unity, displayed the wisdom and maturity of the party, its courage and unbreakable internationalism,

What was the stand of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China towards this major event for our party and people? Cold, and I say, insulting. But we did not show it, although we fully understood what they were up to. We did not adopt their wrong stance, but stood unwavering on our revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line towards the Communist Party of China and the fraternal, friendly Chinese people.

Let the communists throughout the world judge who behaved well and who behaved badly, who showed himself firm on the Marxist-Leninist line, and who has vacilated.

This Is Patently a Lie

The failure of the leadership of the Communist Party of China to send its delegation to the 6th congress of our party is not "because of the decision which they took at their 9th congress." This is not true, it is patently a lie. A congress which respects the teachings of Marx and Lenin cannot take such a decision. Such a decision would be anti-Marxist. We know that the 9th congress of the Communist Party of China did not take this decision and the Chinese leadership, which is lying, shows itself to be anti-Marxist twice over, towards its own congress and towards us. It could occur, in certain circumstances and instances, that the Central Committee of a party takes such a decision, and this action would not be wrong, but this decision can never be permanent and never adopted by the congress.

Marxism-Leninism Quickly Shows Up the Trickery of Opportunists

Hence, the decision not to send a delegation of the CP of China to the 6th congress of the party of labour of Albania was taken by Mao and Zhou Enlai because of opposition to our party over line. What is the basis of this opposition? This we have told them openly, like Bolsheviks. They do not speak about this, but gather up and distort what we say and then come out with non-Marxist public stands and reasons.

The fact is that they have lined themselves up with the revisionists, on a course towards conciliation and contacts with the revisionists parties of the world. Hence, for "political" expediency they have begun to adopt a two-faced stand. They have their hearts over there, while they have their stereotyped formulas, their posters for the gallery, because they still need them, here. It is understandable that Marxism-Leninism quickly shows up the trickery of opportunists who use phoney disguises.

Apart from the fact that they did not send a delegation, the attitude of the Chinese leadership towards our 6th congress is also reflected in the press and the radio, and here it has been like a "faded poster" to get by the difficulty and just to observe the formalities.

Their greeting sent to the 6th congress of our party was the usual thing which could have been sent to any kind of party, full of stereotyped phrases, which the Chinese use constantly. It was not signed by Mao, as on other occasions, "because it was beneath his dignity." During the proceedings of the 6th congress, they wrote nothing about it, but an article of ZERI I POPULLIT was reprinted in RENMIN RIBAO, and a report by Chinese journalists who were at the congress, which could be described as a chronicle without any value, was published, and in order to show that they were interested, in the newspapers they began their Chinese tricks about the "olives of friendship," the "Albanian wheat," and other such things which do not go down.

The greeting on the 30th anniversary of the founding of our party was simply the greeting which they sent to the 6th congress with a few stereotyped formulas added or removed. This too, was spiritless like the anonymous greeting they sent us on the occasion of the election of the new Central Committee of our party.

This is the "entire effort" that the comrades of the Chinese leadership made about the 6th congress of our heroic party which, when the Communist Party of China and China itself were under furious attack by everybody, from all sides, defended them with Marxist-Leninist determination. Only the party of labour of Albania, only socialist Albania stood beside them, and with continuous, consistent, principled, stern Marxist-Leninist struggle, defended the Communist Party of China and the triumphs of People's China. We did our duty as internationalists and as their firm friends. History will judge us in the future as it does now and will always consider that right is on the side of the party of labour of Albania and the People's Republic of Albania.

The Chinese leadership thinks that "now they are over the river they have no further need for the horse." But through all the centuries of our history, we Albanians have not carried anyone on our backs, have never tolerated such a thing, but those who have had such ideas have taken such a beating from the Albanians that they never forget, however many centuries go by and however the circumstances change. Friendship on a Marxist-Leninists

internationalist basis is sacred to us Albanians, as a people and as Marxists, and we have fought and will fight for this, courageously and persistently. We shall struggle for true Marxist-Leninist friendship with the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people, a friendship which is sacred to us, and we shall be prudent, mature and patient, but we shall defend the Marxist-Leninist principles of our party, as we defend our lives, and will fight all those, whoever they may be, who seek to distort and attack them.

The Course of the Silent Boycott of Albania Is Being Followed

Is the title of the note of Tuesday, March 14, 1977, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes among others:

Two weeks have gone by since Nixon left China.

China's stand towards us at present is cold. It maintains no contacts with us, either with our ambassador in Peking, or through the Chinese ambassador in Tirana. . . . regard to the talks with Nixon, up till now they have not bothered to give us any information, not even a simply banal paraphrase of the Sino-American communique.

It may be asked, why should they inform us when we were against Nixon's going to Peking? Yes, we were against it, but we told them our opinion openly, like friends and comrades. Then, if they consider us friends and comrades, it is their duty to inform us and have the courage to say to us, "You were wrong," or "We were wrong," or "Neither you nor we were wrong," or by way of information, "You Albanian comrades can draw your own conclusions." "We are informing you because we are comrades, notwithstanding that we are not in agreement on this question." This would be the most correct way. We followed this open and comradely course. Up till now, the Chinese are pursuing the course of silence and the silent boycott of Albania.

The Chinese ambassador in Tirana has shut himself up in his "ivory tower," and when ZERI I POPULLIT writes the article against Nixon, he sends the XINHUA agents to ask our people, "Who wrote this article, where can these references be found?" and other questions, which appear absurd, but which have a purpose,

Of course we shall see, but this revisionist political boycott of China against us may spread like an oil slick. Reaction and the other revisionists are noticing this stand of China and have begun to point it out. On our part, we shall strengthen our line, display our very sincere desire for friendship with the fraternal and allied Chinese people. However, we shall never cease the struggle against American imperialism and modern revisionism. If China comes to agreement with American imperialism, then obviously the contradictions and the struggle with us will increase. We do not want this, and hope that this possibility will

not come to pass, but if it does, we shall fight and overcome it, we shall defend our Marxist-Leninist line and will triumph.

The Visit of a Deputy-Foreign Minister of China to Tirana

On Friday, September 1, 1972, Comrade Enver Hoxha writes:

The Deputy Foreign Minister Qiao Guanhua came to Albania on a working visit, at the invitation of our Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to discuss together, as the allies we are, the problems of this year's session in the UNO. He passed through Romania on his way here. There he had talks with Manescu. In his talks with our comrades he said, "He was not satisfied with those talks," and abused Manescu as a rogue, saying that "Romania follows a policy like that of capitalist state," that they left his comrades without a meal, and that he would tell Zhou Enlai that "The aircraft which flies on the route from Beijing should fly direct from Athens to Tirana, without going through Bucharest," etc.

Qiao Guanhua stayed no more than two days in Tirana, and asked that nothing should be written in the press. Why? He gave no reason. But in fact, according to what our comrades say, he took great pleasure in boasting. However, this is of no importance, a small matter. He had talks with comrades Nesti, Reiz and Ceno, and then was received by Comrade Mehmet, too.

Qiao Guanhua came to our country on the pretext of our invitation to discuss the problems of the UNO and to exchange opinions about "the international horizon." In fact, however, the true purpose of his visit was to "bring us up to date" in an ambiguous way about the question of Lin Biao and "about the correct tactics" of the current Chinese policy in the international field. Both to the comrades of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and especially to Comrade Mehmet, Qiao Guanhua presented himself as "specially instructed by Zhou Enlai to talk openly and in a comradely way with the comrades of the Albanian leadership about the problems which are worrying us." Apparently, he thought that I would receive him too, a thing which was not realized, because I was in Korca, and he was to stay no more than two days.

During the talks he had with Mehmet (in Korca I read the minutes which had been taken), Qiao Guanhua said two or three words about Lin Biao who "was a rogue, a plotter who tried to flee by aircraft to the Soviet Union, but the aircraft crashed and burned in the vicinity of Ulan Bator. At one time Lin Biao wanted to escape to Hong Kong, but later he took the road to Mongolia." This is what he said about Lin Biao, no more and no less--as if to mock us--and this they no doubt call "officially informing the party of labour of Albania."

As it seems from his conversation, his other aim was to convince us that the tactics used by China, whether on the question of talks with the Americans, or in their other stands towards the revisionists and reaction, are correct, principled, Leninist. Hence, they are not violating

principles, are exploiting the contradictions among the enemies, and this is precisely the aim of the compromises which might be reached eventually.

All these things the Chinese comrade tried to put in opposition to our line, implying that on these issues (if there were any), there might be two different views between us, while on everything else we were in agreement. In other words, he wanted to say, "You (the Albanians) are against compromise on tactical questions, which Lenin and Stalin advise, because you do not understand and do not act to deepen the contradictions which exist between the enemies. Hence, you are sectarian and leftist, if not ultra-leftist."

Naturally, these insinuations of Qiao Guanhua have no foundation, are provocative. Without making any mention of our letter sent to their Central Committee on the occasion of Nixon's going to Peking, the Chinese comrade meant that, with what he said, he was officially replying to this letter and, naturally, he rejected it....

Our theses prove that, as always, we are neither sectarian rightist, nor leftist, but are principled, fight on the two flanks, against imperialism and revisionism, fight for the deepening of contradictions and make compromises with those states and at those times and in those circumstances which we judge favourable to us, but never over matters of principle and ideology.

In other notes, Comrade Enver Hoxha points out and exposes the aims of the economic pressures of the Chinese leadership towards Albania.

The Chinese Have Not Yet Decided Where They Will Get the Technological Equipment for Our Metallurgical Combine

Is the title of the note of Saturday, September 30, 1972.

Last evening, writes Comrade Enver Hoxha, I attended the dinner which the Chinese ambassador gave on the occasion of the 23d anniversary of the proclamation of the People's Republic of China.

...Without raising the issues as a problem, because our economic delegation will do this when it goes to Beijing, I spoke about our difficulties in securing supplies of many raw materials, about the high cost of transport, and the long time required for the transport of goods which come from China to Albania. With this I hinted to him that China should secure many of these goods for us from the countries of Europe with which it has trade relations.

The ambassador said, also, that they will try to get the technological equipment for our metallurgical combine from Canada. In other words, they have not yet solved the key problem for this very important major project. This presents many dangers for us. We shall see what develops.

The Chinese Government Does Not See the Possibility of Fulfilling Our
Economic Requirements

Writes Comrade Enver Hoxha in the note of Sunday, October 15, 1972.

Our ambassador in Beijing, he points out, transmitted to us the text of the conversation which he had with a Chinese official who had communicated to him the opinion of his government about the following:

Our comrades had presented to Fang Yi, when he was in Tirana, certain requests connected with the problems of our perspective plan for 1975-1980, and concretely about increasing the capacity for smelting ferro-nickel, the construction of the Koman hydropower station and the extension of the Ballsh thermal-power station. However, for the time being, the Chinese Government does not see it possible to fulfill these requests. They gave their "difficulties" as the reason, saying: "We do not have big reserves," "We shall see, let us first build the things we have undertaken," etc.

These excuses of theirs are unfounded. We shall return to this major problem again.

CSO: 2020

- END -

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

Aug 20, 1979

DD.